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

To: Terri Rahal/Karen Watkins/Mark Lundquist/Molly Wiltshire/Don Holland

From: Chuck Bell, Pres.

P. O. Box 193 - Lucerne Valley, CA 92356

(760) 964- 3118 [chuckb@sisp.net](mailto:chuckb@sisp.net)

Richard Selby, V. Pres.

P. O. Box 941 – Lucerne Valley, CA 92356

(760) 885-8292 [raselby2016@yahoo.com](mailto:raselby2016@yahoo.com)

Date: October 25, 2017

**RE: COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT LUCERNE VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN**

(**NOTE: The following comments on the “LV Action Plan” also include a summary of its specific ‘actions’ in order to inform our community members of what we are expected to perform).**

The “LV Com. Plan” link we pulled from the website is really an “Action Plan” – one that might lead to a final community plan – but not the “Plan” we expected. We will make comments on the “complete” LV Plan when posted.

This Community Plan should be retitled “Action Plan for Community Policies In-Lieu of an Existing Community Plan”.

Quote:

*The existing Community Plan content was used in the development of the new draft Community Plan and Countywide Plan. Goals and policies from the existing community plan, as well as proposed land use changes discussed during the community workshops, will be considered for inclusion in the County Policy Plan, a component of the Countywide Plan. The Land Use Map will be adopted as part of the County Policy Plan. The content of the draft Community Plan focuses on those actions identified by the community that the community is willing to take to make desired changes to their community. The County Policy Plan and the Community Plans will both be web-based, with adoption of the Countywide Plan in late 2018.*
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It looks like our full “Community Plan” will be posted hither and yon over a number of sites making it difficult for many of our community members without computers (and those of us with them but not all that computer savvy) to access it – and likely making it hard for staff to fully comprehend in a single document what Lucerne Valley is all about and what directions we want to take. We reiterate our prior request for a minimum of 3 printed copies of our ‘complete’ Plan when done. And that to include the entirety of at least our 2007 LV Com. Plan’s policies and objectives. One for the library (non-check out) – LVEDA – and the JV/LV MAC. The county needs to understand the full ramifications of computer and technology limitations experienced by members of a State-designated “Severely Economically Disadvantaged Community”

We appreciate that our major issues were captured in the “Action Plan” – however as much as we pride ourselves on being a “self help” community - there is absolutely no way we can fully implement the great majority of the so-called ‘actions’ due to the limitations expressed below. We can only hope that this section was authored by the consultants that are oriented to urban environments and plans – typical Planning 101 stuff - not written by County staff that we have worked with for years who understand the reality of rural unincorporated communities. As you are hearing from other communities – the Action Plans aren’t popular and won’t get done. In most cases – physically can’t get done. However we will try to be as polite as we can in our responses.

***Quote: The Action Plans Are Not Set in Stone***

*The Action Plans are to be used to guide community actions and are not “set in stone”. Champions and Action Leaders are suggestions, but your community has a better idea of the best Champion for individual actions. The Action process is a general set of tasks that can be modified by the Champion, Action Leaders and/or Action Teams to best fit your community. The community should feel free to make changes and find alternatives for completing actions.*

Appreciated. Preliminary comments and ideas as follows:

***Action Statement A.1: Aspire to be a model renewable energy community with a***

***principal focus on point-of-use, rooftop solar. Utility scale solar and wind***

***projects, primarily intended to serve Lucerne Valley, should only be permitted in***

***designated areas such as Tamarisk Flats to minimize the visual impact on the***

***landscape.***

**Benchmark:** Regular coordination with the County of San Bernardino and renewable

energy developers ensuring new renewable energy projects are consistent with community

character.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Renewable Energy Committee

**Estimated Cost:** $2,500–$3,000

2

Nice thoughts = but it’s too late for this one as stated. Years of “coordination” with the County (especially the BOS) got us nowhere. At the onset of this solar ‘invasion’ we originally focused on “Tamarisk Flats” as a potential site for large-scale PV solar, but **NOT TO BE A NIMBY COMMUNITY**, however as we have informed Planning – **said area is ONLY available for a potential community solar project just for us** – no more area to give - due to all these projects:

The two Lone Valley PV projects in place on Camprock Rd.. Another huge solar project for Lucerne Valley (“Calcite Solar” – 4 parcels  – 630 acres – 100 MWs) – the third just filed with a diluted RECE in effect – combined with the following solar projects recently filed to avoid RECE’s stipulations. “Sienna Solar”  - 990 acres - 300 MW. “Ord Mountain Solar”  - 485 acres - 200 MW. SCE’s pending “Calcite Substation” with 116 acres to accommodate these projects and the potential to transmit 1000's of MW's of future projects. Potentially pending “Sorrell/Aurora” on State School Lands on 2650 - 4.550 acres. And who knows what’s pending on BLM’s Development Focus Areas and State School Lands in our community via the DRECP?

We don’t need a “LV Renewable Energy Committee”. We need the County Renewable Energy Element (RECE) document that was submitted to the BOS – before it gutted protection for community plan areas. And does the cost come out of our pocket? The LV-JV MAC Land Use Committee (LUC) has been performing this role for at least the last 11 years.

***Action Statement A.2: Encourage the County to adopt rural desert development***

***standards more befitting the high desert community and in keeping with Lucerne***

***Valley’s rural character and sense of openness.***

**Benchmark:** Draft development standards and design guidelines for rural desert

development in Lucerne Valley. Submit to the County and Lucerne Valley. Design review

board is established.

**Champion:** Community Organizations

**Estimated Cost:** None.

We don’t need a Lucerne Valley “Design Review Bd”. We have been promoting said rural standards for years – didn’t even get them entrenched in our 2007 Community Plan. LVEDA can work with Planning on a less formal basis – but you know what ‘rural standards’ are and let’s just get them implemented! Again, LV-JV MAC Land Use Committee (LUC) has been performing this role for at least the last 11 years.
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***Action Statement A.3: Partner with organizations and land trusts to protect and***

***conserve Lucerne Valley’s unique natural desert habitats and wildlife corridors,***

***and to maintain the balance between the human and natural communities to***

***maintain a functioning desert/mountain transitional ecosystem.***

**Benchmark**: Partnering with organizations like the Mojave Desert Land Trust to regularly

organize conservation efforts to protect the desert habitat, safeguard natural resources,

improve the understanding of challenges facing the desert ecosystem, and emphasize the

importance of maintaining a balance for the good of the entire community. Working

closely with the Mojave Desert Land Trust and a broad range of community members and

visitors, as well as governmental agencies, to offer hands-on learning experiences and

volunteer opportunities. [Development of a desert conservation plan for the community.]

**Champion**: Lucerne Valley Conservation Committee

**Estimated Cost**: $3,000–$5,000

Nice words – but does the MDLT even know about this? We are currently working with it on a land conservation project. LVEDA – initially formed to promote economic development - has had to take the role of a “LV Conservation Committee” in order to protect our environment and land-use integrity from all the industrial-scale solar projects that the County either has approved or has accepted applications for processing. If even one of these pending projects gets approved – it would in and by itself significantly dilute our potential for ‘protecting etc. etc. etc. If all of them get approved – cumulative impacts would devastate our community character – and any real potential for implementing this otherwise beneficial Action Statement. And by the way – who is responsible for the $3 to 5K? We sure are unable to pay this cost.

***Action Statement A.4: Establish a landscaping and lighting guide to help current***

***and new residents and businesses either install or modify landscaping and***

***lighting to meet the needs of the desert and dark sky regulations.***

**Benchmark:** A landscaping and lighting guide is implemented and shared throughout

the community for use in new development and renovated areas.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Landscaping Organization

**Estimated Cost:** Variable depending on proposed improvements

This one won’t happen. The County needs to require and ENFORCE lighting and ‘dark sky’ regulations. You don’t need us. Just do it. And for landscaping – whoever wrote this one didn’t do a drive-around. Our landscaping primarily consists of old vehicles and junk. However we do have a very productive “Garden Club” that maintains the native desert vegetation at the Senior Center – plus holds an annual native/xeric plant sale. That’s the best we can do with the limitations associated with our “Severely Economically Disadvantaged” demographics. Also, this is an adjudicated basin with a Watermaster to answer to as well as a groundwater authority in the Mojave Water Agency (MWA).
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***Action Statement A.5: Establish a welcome program to greet new residents,***

***educate them on the unique desert experience, and offer them information***

***regarding the community.***

**Benchmark:** All new residents and businesses in Lucerne Valley are greeted with

information and education regarding the community, and introduce long-term residents

who can serve as resources.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley welcome committee

**Estimated Cost:** variable, depending on programs offered

This one gave us a real chuckle. Some of these Action Statements are almost entertaining. Was the Chamber contacted about this one? Due to our unfortunate demographics – some of our population are itinerant. We ‘welcome’ new residents that attend LVEDA, etc. meetings and seek out those that might be productive members, but no way can we form a “committee” to hang around a street waiting for a moving van (most likely a pickup filled to the brim) – and hand out cupcakes. Most recent new members are Asians establishing farms (which help to maintain our rural character) but don’t assimilate much. Looks like others are moving in to grow illegal pot and they probably wouldn’t be too excited about confronting a “welcoming committee”. Rural communities like Lucerne Valley are so spread out that it’s very difficult to organize and maintain such an activity. Possibly through the Chamber of Commerce this could happen but seems not that likely.

***Action Statement B.1: Establish community-based design guidelines that***

***encourage a common rural design theme for commercial building façades to***

***assist designers in meeting community expectations and to create a cohesive***

***architectural style within the business district.***

**Benchmark**: Preparation of a set of design guidelines for review and potential adoption

by County.

**Champion**: Design committee

**Estimated Cost**: Volunteer time

Another nice thought – but more appropriate for a place like Pioneertown. Was the Chamber consulted re: this? It isn’t equipped nor likely for this type of work. Rural character (which we want) doesn’t necessarily require buildings to look like a movie western town with fake facades. Our business district is what it is – some of it not exactly ‘scenic’ – but works just fine for the community due to dedicated owners who provide many services and are dedicated to the community more than for profit. No way are we going to ask them to ‘modify their existing buildings’. Most of them can barely afford to even be in them. We would have hoped even the consultants would understand what a “Severely Disadvantaged Community” really is – and not get all urban/yuppiefied with these ‘actions’. The 2007 Community Plan mentions this western theme.
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***Action Statement B.2: Promote Lucerne Valley as an ideal location for the***

***development of a senior living facility, in particular, close to the Lucerne Valley***

***Senior Center.***

**Benchmark**: Regular coordination with the San Bernardino County Economic

Development Agency regarding local available properties.

**Champion**: Lucerne Valley Economic Development Association or private property

owners

**Estimated Cost:** Dependent on promotion programs and materials created.

This ‘action’ is certainly appropriate – one that LVEDA has been working on for a number of years – and commissioned a “needs assessment’ that has provided excellent input re: design, etc. When it comes to the County EDA – looks like we are on our own. After having to get BOS help in getting County EDA reps. to at least 2 meetings over the past years – re: the senior project and others – staff says all the right things – says they will get back with us – nothing happens. Can’t even get them to help us write or get grants. Am sure they will not be of any help re: “local available properties”. We got realtors for that – plus already have the site for the senior projects. However it is good to have this in our real LV Com Plan – even though we are already doing it and the Chamber won’t likely have any more luck with County EDA than we have – and isn’t likely to deal with them. It would be nice if they did. We (LVEDA) have already approached EDA on how to fund our current senior housing project concept and it was difficult to fit a rural type project in their urban development box.

***Action Statement B.3: Advocate for limiting industrial development to only those***

***areas adjacent to the existing railroad tracks in southeastern Lucerne Valley.***

**Benchmark**: Limit industrial development to areas designated specifically for such

development.

**Champion**: Lucerne Valley Economic Development Association

**Estimated Cost:** Volunteer time.

This is important and appreciated. We seek industrial development - especially products related to cement, aggregates and limestone - that our local mines produce – that unlike solar projects - provide permanent jobs, increased property tax revenue, etc. This ‘action statement’ did not include the prerequisite land exchange with BLM and the Cushenbury Mine Trust (which we have been working on for years with little or no County help) in order to privatize said lands along the railroad tracks to allow said industrial development. Our 2007 Community Plan designates all of said potential area for “Industrial” zoning upon transfer to private ownership – another reason we absolutely need said plan to remain intact and incorporated into this Plan. (Note: ‘gravel production’ is south of Hwy 18).
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***Action Statement B.4: Partner with a housing advocacy group or nonprofit to***

***identify and rehabilitate existing housing stock, recognizing a number of existing***

***homes are in need of repair or have been abandoned.***

**Benchmark:** Identify housing advocacy groups and available programs to provide

Lucerne Valley with the needed rehabilitation assistance.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Chamber of Commerce, community

**Estimated Cost:** Dependent upon level of rehabilitation required.

Did anyone talk to the Chamber about this? Nice thoughts – but beyond our capabilities, time and human resources (as are most of these ‘actions’). Rehab assistance would be great – but isn’t that what County EDA is for? Much of our re-hab needs would require County Code Enforcement to set in motion what’s really necessary – demolition. And CE is overwhelmed with all the crap it has to deal with – understaffed – slow in acting if it acts at all. We have a 20 year old list of projects needing “enforcement’ – with only a few completed. We can’t handle this one.

***Action Statement B.5: Investigate methods of financing a revolving fund to assist***

***with the rehabilitation of owner-occupied homes, which would improve the***

***community’s aesthetics while creating local jobs for contractors and handy-men.***

**Benchmark:** Determine whether Lucerne Valley will seek to become a Community

Housing Development Organization (CHDO) or Community Development Corporation

(CDC) or plan to apply for funding through the County. Once a revolving loan fund to

assist with rehabilitation is set up, monitor the number of loans given and repaid

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Economic Development Association

**Estimated Cost:** Dependent upon level of program desired. $20,000 - $100,000 in initial

seed money for a revolving fund.

Another nice idea – LVEDA can be involved - but way the hell beyond our capabilities to take it on as proposed. Even within LVEDA – there are only a handful that do any LVEDA-related work. Everyone else (members that come and go at our meetings) is busy volunteering for other organizations. This one would take a full time consultant – a separate corporation. And which County dept. would be involved? County EDA hasn’t done much for us in the past? Another doubtful ‘action’.

***Action Statement C.1: Coordinate with the County Public Works Department and***

***Caltrans to prioritize local roads in need of improvement, to ensure regular***

***maintenance of the road system, and to increase the safety of the community’s***

***roads***

**Benchmark:** Identify stakeholders who are committed to improving safety along Lucerne

Valley roads through regular maintenance and submit request to form a road

maintenance zone.
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**Champion:** Community

**Estimated Cost:** Contingent upon level of improvements

For over 30 years, the Chamber and now LVEDA, maintains an on-going road project list working with County Trans. and Caltrans. Every year we ask for a status – usually get response – “No funds”. We will keep it up nevertheless – but occasionally some success in getting something done. The Special Districts’ ‘Road Maintenance Zone/District option is brought up every time someone complains about their non-County maintained road needing work. Amazing how much of even our developed housing tracts have so many non-maintained roads. Some are dragged by residents to at least reduce washboarding. After all the advertising of the ‘road district’ option – there have been no recent takers due to expense – not enough homes on said road to participate financially – no effort on part of homeowners, etc. We think the only ‘road district’ with roads maintained by Special Districts, is a short segment, but the expense forced the homeowners to amend the agreement to only work after flooding, was under complete maintenance but the expense. Again – we keep emphasizing our unfortunate economic status and demographics – but this and other action items just can’t grasp the reality of it. This has been tried in the past. The community understands this issue and finds it very hard to accomplish a Roads District based on Assessment District due to the large number of absentee owners.

***Action Statement C.2: Partner with the Lucerne Valley & Johnson Valley Municipal Advisory Council and the County on a project to install new and more readable street name signs throughout the communities.***

**Benchmark:** Systematically replace all street name signs in Lucerne Valley and Johnson

Valley with new, highly retroreflective street name signs within a two-year period.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley & Johnson Valley Municipal Advisory Council.

**Estimated Cost**: Sign replacement and installation: $800–$1,000 each

Another great idea but not a high priority vs. other road projects. If the County or Caltrans or whatever can’t come up with $ to do simple road improvements – where will the sign $ come from – grants? The County is welcome to file for some. Beyond our capabilities. But LVEDA and the MAC are more than willing to advise re: priority roads if the County is serious about this. Street signs were installed a few years ago. This is a non-issue as far as I can see.

***Action Statement C.3: Continue efforts to designate California State Highway***

***247/Old Woman Springs Road declared a Scenic Highway.***

**Benchmark:** Scenic Highway 247 proposal submitted to the Caltrans District Scenic

Highway Coordinator for review within a three-year period.

**Champion:** Scenic 247 Committee

**Estimated Cost:** Volunteer time.
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This is in progress and we greatly appreciate County Planning’s help with it (Terri and Karen). However due to Planning’s staff and budget limitations – we have to do the work that the County is supposed to do per Caltrans’ Scenic Highway regulations and standards – and have so agreed. If even one of the many, filed solar projects on the Barstow Rd. segment of our “Scenic Highway 247” effort get approved – the road’s “eligibility” per Caltrans’ standards could well be in jeopardy due to ‘significant visual intrusions’ – therefore resulting in denial of the scenic designation. It’s always amazing how County government supposedly supports something (ie: scenic status) – but in turn potentially killing it off with policies or lack thereof (ie: denying us a solar project moratorium until the final RECE is in place – but granted – not yet approved). That’s what happens when government entities don’t analyze actions beyond their own arenas.

***Action Statement C.4: Coordinate with the County, Caltrans, the school district,***

***and other stakeholders to develop a Safe Routes to School Program for Lucerne***

***Valley children.***

**Benchmark:** A Safe Routes to School program for the Lucerne Valley community is

established.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Unified School District

**Estimated Cost:** Contingent upon level of improvements

Was the School Dist. contacted about adding this one? Great idea but more appropriate for an urban developed area. “Infrastructure projects must be within 2 miles of a grade school or middle school.” Most of these students live more than 2 miles from said schools. So how far from a high school (which includes our middle school)? Not too feasible to expect kids to walk or bike to school when a lot of them live up to 10-20 miles away. Would require a lot of private party permissions or easements through unimproved properties – mostly all in sandy dirt which is tough for bike riding. And need a wide path to avoid snake bites! This one probably won’t happen. “Safe Routes”, should have the School District weigh-in. They are probably already doing this in-house.

***Action Statement C.5: Explore desert road development standards that downplay***

***the need for urban street improvements such as street lighting, curb and gutter,***

***and sidewalks excepts as needed for safety.***

**Benchmark:** County Development Code is amended to include desert road requirements

and County Standard Plans to reflect rural desert characteristics.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Economic Development Association

**Estimated Cost:** None

Great. More than happy to work on rural road standards. But see “Rural Standards’ above. Hasn’t worked so far. We don’t think much will come of this – especially not much chance of any new roads anytime soon. Hard enough just to get improvements and repaving on existing ones. If the County was serious about
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this – knowing we want ‘rural standards’ - we wouldn’t have a Dollar General Store with a sidewalk to nowhere and a left turn lane into it that wiped out the legal turn lane on the other side of the highway. We keep experiencing a lot of counter and counterfeit actions among County departments – thus its relative unpopularity (a more polite term than often expressed here).

***Action Statement D.1: Encourage community members to lobby the California***

***State Legislature to change state law to allow hauled water for certain types and***

***locations of homes.***

**Benchmark:** Meeting with San Bernardino County Environmental Health Services to

present documentation on why they should support hauled water in the areas of the

region where other water sources are inadequate.

**Champion:** Community coalition

**Estimated Cost:** Volunteer time.

Way too late on this one also. We have been working on it for over 10 years. The County Dept. of EHS took it upon itself to adopt an internal policy – never a County ordinance – never stated in the Dev. Code – to prohibit hauled water to new single family rural development solely based on a ‘recommendation’ from State Health. We met at least 2 or 3 times with two Third District Supervisors who said they agreed with us. All they had to do was tell EHS to rescind its dept. policy. They never did. Then the State passed legislation prohibiting it for new development. Assemblyman Obernolte submitted legislation to reverse it – but it died in the same Leg. Committee that wrote the original bill. There is little point in continuing to pursue it with the County which can take the fall-back, lame position that the “State denies it – we can’t violate State law”. Used to be we had a County gov. that would tell the State to go to Hell. Apparently no longer. We will have to take a different approach in order to fight this ridiculous law which is based on a fallacy – there have not been any recorded water quality/health impacts from hauled water from a licensed hauler and a permitted source. This is a definite ‘property right taking’ that the County needs to own up to.

***Action Statement D.2: Support the Mojave Basin Area Adjudication as it relates to***

***water production rights.***

**Benchmark:** Use Mojave Basin water sustainably while honoring water production rights.

**Champion:** Community residents and businesses

**Estimated Cost:** Volunteer time and fiscal impact on user rates.

This is a good Action – but it is currently being handled by the Lucerne Valley (ESTE) Sub Area Advisory Committee to the Watermaster – 5 reps. elected by adjudicated parties based on their water rights – a committee created under the adjudication’s court Judgment. We are working with the Watermaster- educating residents and realtors on dealing with new farmers that are pumping more than
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the ‘minimal’ 10 ac’/year threshold without water rights – therefore 'pumping

outside of the Judgment’. The Mojave Desert Resource Conservation District and MWA (Watermaster) have published flyers in both English and Korean to inform subject parties of the need to obtain water rights.

***Action Statement D.3: Coordinate with County Flood Control to improve flood***

***mitigation measures throughout the community and advocate for a stormwater***

***retention basin to effectively capture stormwater runoff.***

**Benchmark:** Establish community support for implementation and community funding of

flood mitigation measures and a potential stormwater basin. Establish a Special District to

support construction funding. Design and construct the stormwater basin.

**Champion**: Community Flood Control, Special District

**Estimated Cost:** $35,000,000–$40,000,000

Quote: *“Lucerne Valley is in Flood Control Zone of which currently do not have any flood control facilities”.* This is an incorrect statement. Storm flows from a portion of the north slope watershed are collected in a control channel which flows through the center of townbut ends at Rabbit Springs Rd. which occasionally floods making it impassable. It was intended to flow across the road into Lucerne Dry Lake, but seldom does. The Action fails to mention that flood control facilities and detention/retention basins allow for percolation of natural drainage into our aquifers within areas of coarse alluvium that is best for percolation to groundwater. We worked with County Flood Control and MWA in pursuit of small basins along the upper stretches of Cushenbury Wash, primarily on a BLM parcel that it can donate to the County under its “Public Purpose Act’ – which would be an ideal location to percolate water to the aquifer – and **reduce flooding of a housing tract as well as on HWY 247 and at least 3 County roads** and reduce flows to the Lucerne Dry Lake area where water doesn’t percolate but only evaporates into the atmosphere. This is of no use for us or any other resource. County Flood Control produced a report that stated it had to be built to accommodate a 100 year storm which would not be of smaller basins for typical storm flows but at a cost described in this Action as untenable in our rural, minimally funded Flood Control 6 District. No way could a local “Special District” be formed to fund it.

***Action Statement D.4: Coordinate with the State Department of Water Resources***

***(DWR) to have the agency update its analysis of the Lucerne Valley Groundwater***

***Basin.***

**Benchmark:** Verified that the California Department of Water Resources has completed the

2020 Comprehensive Bulletin 118 Update, including an update on the analysis of the

Lucerne Valley Groundwater Basin. The County is using the updated information when

making development decisions for the area.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley & Johnson Valley Municipal Advisory Council

**Estimated Cost:** $500–$1,000
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Great Action item – one we all need to be aware of - but it is under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Water Agency/Watermaster. We are an adjudicated groundwater basin administered by the Mojave Basin Watermaster thus under current law – are not directly subject to SWGA or the County. The Watermaster only has to report data from our adjudicated basin periodically and if it fails to maintain groundwater levels and sustainability within certain parameters then the State could take it over under SWGA. There is no need or benefit for us to work directly with DWR or the County being a painful experience at best. The Lucerne Valley (ESTE) Sub Area Advisory Committee to the Watermaster is the best forum to carry out this Action item. This is not in the purview of the MAC.

***Action Statement D.5: Coordinate with the County to centralize a refuse transfer***

***station, sewage treatment plant, bio-solid energy plant, and electrical substation***

***at Tamarisk Flats.***

**Benchmark:** If supported by community, a Special District is created, a feasibility study

completed to confirm the viability of the Tamarisk Flats site and funding obtained for

construction through the Special District.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley EDA, Special District

**Estimated Cost:** $100,000–$155,000,000

We have no idea where this one came from. Quote: *“Lucerne Valley currently does not have a Community Services District or a Water District*”. Not exactly true. We are a Board of Supervisors governed County Service Area (CSA 29) with water and other powers. We certainly don’t need or want to “develop” a local Special District for all this stuff. We have a perfectly good refuse transfer station off Camprock Rd. that takes most trash and all recyclables including tires and some services of which we promoted with success. No need to replace it or create another one (at great expense) unless maybe a sub-transfer station near town for periodic collections, that too is very unlikely. We conducted a “Water/Sewer Assessment Study’ in 2006 which designated a possible community wastewater treatment location within the boundaries of the Rancho Lucerne property which, per prior agreements, would accommodate sewage flows from the community and the development. However, any residential development in LV that required a sewage treatment plant would likely install modular units to serve said development. Where would we get the bio solids to fuel an energy plant? Certainly not from a wastewater plant which in our community wouldn’t produce enough fuel. Why in the hell would we want a utility scale electrical substation at Tamarisk Flats – other than possibly a small one to serve a community solar project. SCE’s proposed Calcite Substation nearby will create enough problems as is.
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***Action Statement E.1: Coordinate with Cal Fire to change the boundaries of the***

***State Responsibility Area (SRA) by shifting the boundary line of the SRA south to***

***include only federals lands along the San Bernardino Mountains.***

**Benchmark:** Engage in discussions with Cal Fire regarding a potential relocation of the

SRA boundary line.

**Champion:** Community, Lucerne Valley & Johnson Valley Municipal Advisory Council

**Estimated Cost:** None.

Good and thanks. Makes sense – probably why it hasn’t gone anywhere yet. So far – after requests – no County efforts yet. The Action needs to include support from our State Assembly and Senate reps. Quote: “*The jurisdictional boundary line separating San Bernardino County Fire Department responsibility from state*

*responsibility (Cal Fire) primarily runs along Highway 247/Old Woman Springs Road as the route goes through Lucerne Valley”.* Said SRA is also south of HWY 18 in Lucerne and Apple Valleys.

***Action Statement E.2: Conduct a community inventory of properties that may be***

***in need of code enforcement action and meet regularly with County Code***

***Enforcement to help point out issues and to determine if there are community based solutions, in particular, with regard to enforcement of property***

***maintenance standards and illegal dumping.***

**Benchmark:** Code enforcement materials are accessible to community members and

regular meetings are held between the Lucerne Valley community and County Code

Enforcement officers.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Chamber of Commerce

**Estimated Cost:** variable depending on projects proposed

Over the years, Code Enforcement issues have been dealt with primarily by LVEDA, but the Chamber would be more than welcome to participate. The MAC has also dealt with these issues as well as local citizens that are sick and tired of seeing illegal trash dumping in our community. This Action is a fine statement – but our experience has indicated – as hard as we try - it won’t work. About 20 years ago we and the Sheriff’s Dept. produced a list of over 30 major, health related code violations. To date – only a few have been enforced and resolved. We periodically do drive-arounds with CE staff – all great and dedicated people – understaffed with apparent lack of Dept. support – showing them significant violations that adversely affect the community – not the minor stuff that is so voluminous that they could never be handled. Even the recent list of violations has hardly been addressed – or at least no visible indication of any action. We will keep trying – but unless CE’s budget and staff are beefed up – we see no resolution. Which is a major problem for us since CE is almost as important as law enforcement – especially in our “Severely Disadvantaged Community”.
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***Action Statement E.3: Advocate for improved health care services for the***

***community with a near-term focus on attracting a mobile medical clinic staffed***

***with a nurse practitioner for regularly scheduled visits to Lucerne Valley.***

**Benchmark:** Access to health care services and improve health care in the community.

**Champion:** Community Advocate

**Estimated Cost:** Dependent upon service procured or availability of County resources.

The community has been working on this, but mostly LVEDA, as an action ongoing. After months of negotiations and preparations - St. Mary’s Hospital in Apple Valley is providing its health van at our Market parking lot on Thursdays for most of the day. It provides the services listed in this Action. We are surprised that Arrowhead Regional Medical Center was the source listed – especially due to its distance from us – albeit certainly a qualified provider.

***Action Statement E.4: Coordinate with the County Public Works Department and***

***the Lucerne Valley Transfer Station to reduce solid waste disposal fees and to***

***expand the types of materials acceptable for disposal.***

**Benchmark:** Completion of a document of fees charged and materials accepted and

present to the San Bernardino County Public Works Department for discussion on or

potential fee reductions.

**Champion:** Local community leaders

**Estimated Cost:** $50–$500,000

We have no idea where this came from. Our refuse transfer station accepts general trash and has bins for recyclables (metal/tires – up to 5 per load/plastics/glass/cardboard/newspaper/paper/etc.). It doesn’t accept large loads of construction/demolition waste. LVEDA helped get the tire collection. Our station does not accept cash – so we don’t know where these costs came from – likely the authors got it wrong citing the cost at the County landfills – certainly not the transfer stations. LV residents are charged @$85/year on their residential property tax bill which covers 1 load/week – 52 loads/year – a pretty good deal. It’s not going to get any less expensive than that. LV’s Household Hazardous Waste collection is not the third Sat. of every month – but @ 4 times/year – with month long notices in our local newspaper and Market ad (which goes to every PO Box). We volunteers (I among them) cannot commit to once a month collection. All these services work well and don’t need adjustments.

***Action Statement E.5: Treat our local homeless and disadvantaged population***

***with respect and assist them with finding adequate housing.***

**Benchmark:** Adequate housing for all populations in the community is identified and

assistance provided where possible.

**Champion:** Local housing advocates

**Estimated Cost:** $1,000
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This is the right idea but how in the world did such a small cost be attributed to such a task? There are organizations that address this issue on a regional basis so maybe the MAC could bring attention to this but it would be difficult to form a body of advocates for this purpose. If the County has all these programs – which don’t seem to be working too well as evidenced by our homeless population – some of which seem to like it that way – it’s up to the County to do it. We aren’t prepared or staffed with sufficient volunteers to take this on – other than advising relevant County departments re: areas that need targeting.

***Action Statement F.1: Partner with local organizations such as the Lucerne Valley***

***Museum Association to establish and operate a Lucerne Valley Museum.***

**Benchmark:** Set up a Lucerne Valley Museum.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Museum Association

**Estimated Cost:** Will vary depending on where museum is housed ($5,000–$250,000)

The Museum Association has been planning to build a new museum for the past two decades at least and have obtained permission from the county to use CSA 29 land for this purpose. Again, funding is the problem. We don’t need an action plan but a grant to get this project off the ground. This is already a plan in action. The very few times that County EDA came to LVEDA meetings – staff said they probably can’t help much and there aren’t many grants (including CBD $) that fund museums.

***Action Statement F.2: Provide better senior programs and activities on a level***

***comparable to those provided to in other neighboring communities.***

**Benchmark:** The Lucerne Valley Senior Center offers a variety of programs and activities

to appeal to diverse interests and needs providing every senior citizen in the community

the opportunity to participate.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Senior Center

**Estimated Cost:** Variable, depending on the project

All that’s needed is some funding for CSA 29 to start this kind of a program. Anyone mention this to our Senior Club? They can barely keep the Senior Center open – let alone perform these tasks – as worthy as they might be. Between paying fire inspection fees – dealing with the lunch program – paying utilities – getting CSA 29 to repair the Center’s roof, etc., etc. – it is unlikely much more can be done. But they have excellent leadership and do what they can.

***Action Statement F.3: Enhance appreciation for the desert in school age children***

***by partnering with local organizations and land trusts to develop a desert***

***education program that studies the natural environment, geology, history, etc.***

***and incorporates field trips.***

**Benchmark**: Set up yearly volunteer and educational opportunities that continue to

operate and improve.
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**Champion**: Lucerne Valley Unified School District

**Estimated Cost**: $500–$1,000 – Create a group of community members to facilitate the

program.

Has the school district been notified or consulted on this? Peter Livingston, Superintendent, is very proud of the advances that the school district has made. The district may already be implementing something of this nature.

***Action Statement F.4: Partner with the Lucerne Valley Unified School District, the***

***San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools, and other educators to ensure that the community’s schools***

**Benchmark:** Student performance and graduation rates increase Lucerne Valley Unified

School District and the community is involved in school activities.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley Unified School District

**Estimated Cost:** $8,000–$40,000

Has the school district been notified or consulted on this?

***Action Statement G.1: Promote programs that assist home and business owners***

***with financing energy-efficiency upgrades.***

**Benchmark:** Community committee with the assistance of the Community Action

Partnership of San Bernardino County (CAPSBC) Energy Education and Environmental

Services (EEES) Program staff regularly organize and maintain information on a wide variety

of energy efficiency services and offer several energy-saving rebates, incentives, and

assistance programs to make homes and businesses more energy efficient.

**Champion**: Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County Energy Education

and Environmental Services

**Estimated Cost:** $500–$1,000

Community Block Grants used to help with some of this in the past. Where does the funding come from. Why should our plan include goals that can, or have been, performed in other arenas? Maybe the county can help with this goal.

Fine idea – but we won’t be able to form a “committee” to do this work. However we can provide information on where to get said services from CAPSBC, etc. Note that w/o much if any help from these sources – the LV Market/Hardware shopping center installed parking lot and roof-top solar – plus a natural gas generator. As we said before – we are a self-help community to the max. extent possible in this environment of rural communities getting left behind. Probably just not enough voters.

***Action Statement G.2: Coordinate with the County to convert the community’s***

***street lights to low color temperature LED street lighting.***

**Benchmark:** Community and County researched and reviewed the potential to use LED

lights in community streetlights and implemented appropriate changes.

**Champion:** Community members and Local business owners

**Estimated Cost:** Contingent upon level of improvements
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We don’t know where this one came from either – more urban oriented than rural – especially for a community like ours that strongly supports ‘dark skies’. Our County Service Area 29 has street light powers and would be the one to make any changes – unlikely due to its consistent low budget. This won’t likely get done without a grant. Just give CSA 29 the funds and a mandate to accomplish this. Why another committee action for something that could be much simpler?

***Action Statement G.3: Programs to educate the community on the importance of***

***a sustainable lifestyle and ways to minimize the footprint left on the***

***environment.***

**Benchmark:** The Lucerne Valley & Johnson Valley Municipal Advisory Council coordinates

with the Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County (CAPSBC) Energy

Education and Environmental Services (EEES) Program staff to organize and maintain

information on a wide variety of sustainability programs.

**Champion:** Lucerne Valley & Johnson Valley Municipal Advisory Council

**Estimated Cost:** $500–$1,000

All very nice and politically correct, but not likely here. This is more oriented for an up-scale community in Marin County.

**CONCLUSION:**

**BY THE WAY! Where will all of the dollars come in all of these actions? Certainly not from this community!**

What is concerning is that if this is what is approved as a Community Plan, then when a developer looks at this and asks the question “Did the community set up the Champion Committee and take action to policy?” If not, then does county planning staff have ANYTHING to rely on for trying to encourage the developer to provide the appropriate policy as applied to whatever he/she is proposing to develop? With our current 2007 Community Plan and revised for some current issues, wouldn’t this be a better or more firm code to enforce? Even the 2007 Plan wasn’t really clear on enforcement. What we need is a CP that is enforceable!

Again, this Community Plan should be retitled “Action Plan for Community Policies In-Lieu of an Existing Community Plan”.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**AS FAR AS WE CAN SEE THE DRAFT COMMUNITY PLAN IS A STEP BACK IN REGARDS TO THE WORK THAT THIS COMMUNITY HAS DONE TO DATE TO ESTABLISH ITS GOALS AND POLICIES THAT WE THOUGHT WERE TRANSMITTED THROUGH THE PLANNING PROCESS. IT’S OUR INTENTION TO TAKE THE EXISTING 2007 COMMUNITY PLAN AND REVISE IT TO ADDRESS SOME CURRENT ISSUES, LIKE RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT, AND CONTINUE TO USE IT AS A POLICIES STATEMENT…..**
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