AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION OF CITY OF SANTEE VIRTUAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

ITEMS 8 & 9

OCTOBER 14, 2020

October 14, 2020 1 2. -000-3 4 MAYOR MINTO: Okay. Thank you very much. takes us to Item No. 8 and 9. Item No. 8 is Second 5 6 Reading and Adoption of an Ordinance Adding Chapter 13.20 7 "Specific Plan District" to Title 13 and Amending Chapter 13.04 "Administration" of the Santee Municipal Code, and 8 9 Approving the Fanita Ranch Specific Plan (Case Files 10 R2017-1 and SP2017-1). And Item No. 9, which is Second Reading and 11 Adoption of an Ordinance Approving and Authorizing 12 Execution of a Development Agreement by the -- by and 13 14 Among the City of Santee and HomeFed Fanita Rancho, LLC. Melanie. 15 16 DIRECTOR KUSH: Yes, thank you, Mayor, Vice Mayor Koval, Councilmembers. Good evening. As these items are 17 combined, I will briefly summarize both, which were 18 19 introduced on September 23rd. Ordinance 580 pertains to 2.0 the changes to the zone code. There are three parts to 21 those changes. First, is the change to the base zone of 22 Fanita Ranch to reflect a Specific Plan classification. May I have the next slide or the PowerPoint presentation 23 24 up, please, Annette. 25 CITY CLERK: Yes, ma'am.

1 DIRECTOR KUSH: Thank you. 2 CITY CLERK: Melanie, you have a PowerPoint? DIRECTOR KUSH: Yes. It's -- it's in the S Drive, 3 your -- under "PowerPoint presentations." Nevertheless, 4 5 I can move on, if it's not available. As I mentioned, 6 the first part is the change to the base zone for the 7 property. 8 The second, is the addition of Chapter 13.20, 9 to the zone code. It would -- it is titled Specific Plan District. And this chapter will state the purpose and 10 11 intent of the Specific Plan District, consistent with the Specific Plan Land Use Designation, reflected in the 12 resolution adopted on -- on -- on September 23rd. 13 14 And thirdly, the change includes the adoption of the Fanita Ranch Specific Plan itself. This Specific 15 16 Plan establishes the overarching vision for the property, 17 and includes development standards for the implementation 18 of that project. 19 The -- the other ordinance, Ordinance No. 581, 20 relates to the Development Agreement itself. The agreement was introduced on the 23rd of September and 21 22 is -- it is ready for adoption tonight. 23 The P Terms of the Development Agreement include the construction of a fire station that is fully 24 25 staffed and equipped. It includes a community center

```
and -- and a community park. It will also provide
 1
 2.
     improvements to our aquatic facility in Town Center, or
 3
    provide additional amenities in the community park.
 4
               It includes the State Route 52 improvements
 5
     that must be made before the first home is occupied.
 6
     There is over 1600 acres dedicated to open space and the
 7
     conservation and management of that open space.
 8
               $2.6 million in an affordable housing fund to
 9
     the City and an additional $2.6 million towards a Capital
     Improvement Program project.
10
11
               Those -- those are the highlights of the
12
    Development Agreement. Staff is recommending that you
     adopt or -- or -- adopt the ordinances and with no
13
14
     further ado, that concludes my presentation.
          MAYOR MINTO: Thank you very much.
15
16
          DIRECTOR KUSH: You're welcome.
17
          MAYOR MINTO: Speaker slips?
18
          CITY CLERK: Yes, Mayor Minto. The first one I have
19
     is Mary Hyder.
2.0
          MS. HYDER: Can you hear me?
21
          CITY CLERK: Yes.
22
          MAYOR MINTO: Yes.
          MS. HYDER: Okay. Okay. So I -- this will be for 8
23
     and 9. I believe the City Council has acted in bad faith
24
25
     since 2018, in regards to its handling of the Citizens'
```

Initiative, that if passed, would require voters in

Santee to approve changes, such as this, to the General

Plan.

This Council has been stringing citizens along since 2018, by first requiring a "study," on the impacts of the initiative, resulting in a delay, getting the initiative on the ballot in 2018, which has resulted in it appearing on the General Election Ballot of 2020. Fine.

One would think because of the stalling of the Citizens' Initiative that Council is saying, let the voters speak to Measure N. But no. This City Council, with a total of four votes, went nuclear on September 23rd, and approved the substantial change to the General Plan. Let that sink in. Four votes, by this City Council, disenfranchised the thousands of signatures gathered for the Citizens' Initiative in 2018, and the unknown number of votes for or against Measure N, that were slated to happen within six weeks of that meeting.

Nuclear, because if I'm reading the last sentence of Section 3.2 of the Development Agreement, it appears that if measure passes, this Development Agreement is not subject to Measure N.

So you know, there have been numerous citizen comments for and against this amendment to the General

2.

Plan in recent months. There -- there are votes to be (Inaudible) in November for or against Measure N. Why can't the City Council hold off on the action until Measure N results are in and yield to the will of the electorate? Thank you.

CITY CLERK: The next speaker I have is Dan Bickford. You just need to unmute, Dan.

MR. BICKFORD: Thank you. Well, tonight, just two weeks following the important 4 to 1 approval of Fanita Ranch, we still face a small group of Fanita folks now trying to delay the benefits, for years, just to hold another election.

I see the paid petition gatherers now, harassing local residents to stop a project. A project that fixes our highway traffic, our highway traffic issues before anyone can own a -- a -- occupy a home in Fanita Ranch. A project that leaves three-quarters of the land as natural open space. A project that builds a desperately-needed new fire station. A project that provides millions, every year, for police, fire and schools. A project that gives more than it takes. A project that leaves our City better today -- better than it is today. That's what we are trying to stop. That's a bad idea. I thank the City Council for your thoughtful decision and the City Staff for your hard work to make

1 Fanita the incredible project that it is today. 2. you. 3 CITY CLERK: The next speaker I have is Lynda 4 Marrokal. 5 MS. MARROKAL: Hi, can you hear me? 6 MAYOR MINTO: Yes. 7 MS. MARROKAL: Good evening, Mayor and Vice Mayor, and City Council and Staff. I just wanna say that I am 8 9 so thankful that you guys stood up and you passed this project to benefit all of Santee. 10 We -- and back in 2018, we never had a 11 pandemic. We didn't have what we're facing now. We knew 12 we were facing problems with the budget, but nothing to 13 14 this magnitude in 2020. So people that wanna go back and 15 live in 2018, it's not gonna work. We're in 2020. 16 We got some serious problems, and this project, I am so happy that you decided to take the horn -- bull 17 by the horns and go with this, because it's going to 18 19 benefit so many residents. It's gonna benefit our 2.0 businesses. The community that they're making is a 21 one-of-a-kind community. It's going to allow City of 22 Santee to finally have some upscale housing, along with that 2.6 million for people that are just seeking 23 housing, and then your senior housing. There's five 24

25

different plans of housing for this project, and leaving

2.

76 percent open space for us to enjoy, with all the benefits.

So I applaud you all, and Staff, for working so hard on this project and getting it through, because you have to start thinking of the majority of Santee and not this small interest group that has only fed off of it like a leach. And I just don't understand the logic that this small interest group has, other than self-serving. And they have theirs, but we won't be able to get ours type mentality.

We gotta start thinking of families. We gotta start thinking of all residents, and Fanita Ranch has something for everyone. And I am so happy, and I can't wait for this project to drop, so that people start getting the idea of what this really is about. It'll be the only farm in Santee that will exist. We can actually show our children what it was like in Santee, how I grew up. I -- remember, I grew up here, when there was 300 and something people. There was nobody, and it was harsh. But now, we've turned into a city and have been a city for 40 years. Now it's time to help our citizens. Thank you.

CITY CLERK: Next speaker I have is Allen Jones.

Just need to unmute yourself, Allen.

MR. JONES: I'm here. Good evening, Mayor and Vice

Mayor, along with the Councilmembers. Thank you for 1 2. allowing me to speak in favor of Fanita Ranch. Fanita 3 Ranch is a healthy, good-for-the-environment project that 4 will help the schools of Santee with millions of dollars 5 each year. 6 You'll have your open spaces, trails and parks 7 that everyone wants. Most importantly, though, we are all very familiar with State Route 52 and the headaches 8 9 associated with the saying. HomeFed, in conjunction with the Fanita Ranch, is offering to add money to the project 10 11 to fix the problems with 52. 12 Or the alternative, we can do nothing and continue to weather the ongoing nightmare of State Route 13 14 52 and forgo the monies provided by the project to 15 improve our schools and the City. Respectfully, I'm in 16 favor of Fanita Ranch and I'm asking you to vote the 17 same. Thank you. 18 CITY CLERK: The next speaker I have is Justin 19 Schlaefli. 20 MAYOR MINTO: Are you there, Mr. Schlaefli? CITY CLERK: Let's go with John Olsen and we'll come 21 22 back to Mr. Schlaefli. 23 MAYOR MINTO: Okay. CITY CLERK: John Olsen, if you're there. 2.4 25 MR. OLSEN: Hi, this is John. Thank you, City

2.

Council, Mayor and everyone that's allowing me to speak on behalf of Fanita Ranch, or not on behalf of Fanita Ranch, but for Fanita Ranch. I'm -- I'm for this project. I'm a long-time resident. I am a real estate agent, and no, I will not profit from this property being developed. That's some of the things that are brought up on my Facebook post that I did the other day, trying to get some information out to people that is more informative than the accusations and the emotional direction that the small group of opponents are trying to gen up a lot of -- a lot of opposition to this project, and the -- I don't believe they're using all of the facts.

Anyway, the most important thing to me for this project, Fanita Ranch, is it's going to be filling a large demand for housing. These houses need to be built somewhere in San Diego County. They might as well be built in Santee. If we don't allow them here in Santee, then we are not going to reap the benefits of having 3,000 new homes in town, the benefits of having the 52 improvements completed.

But we'll still have all of the headaches, because these 3,000 houses are going to be built somewhere in the East County and we might as well be able to leverage that and take advantage of that as much as

possible.

2.

The improvements on 52 have been stated several times this evening. That's the biggest part. They're going to be building something here anyway, 1900 houses or 2900 plus houses. We might as we get the improvements on this property and for the 52 to help make everyone's quality of life a little better, make the commutes suck a little less and make Santee a little easier to live in, when you're going to work, on a daily basis, after COVID restrictions are lifted and we go back to "normal."

I think Santee, the City approving the Fanita Ranch project is going to be good for business. Right now, like the young lady said earlier, there are a lot of businesses in town that have to go somewhere else, because there -- there aren't enough houses in the area and they tend to pick up and move to Arizona or Texas, Utah, Idaho. They pick up and leave, because they can't afford to pay their employees the crazy amount for housing that we're seeing in Southern California.

So we need to put a stop to that soon or we aren't going to have a local economy, in Santee, that is going to be able to pay for fire protection, police protection and all of the cool things that we like to enjoy in our community.

So I'm for Fanita Ranch. I urge you to vote,

```
to keep this project moving forward. And I urge everyone
1
 2.
     to vote no on N, because that's bad business for Santee.
 3
     Thank you.
 4
          CITY CLERK: The -- the last speaker on these items
 5
     is Justin Schlaefli. You just need to unmute.
 6
          MR. SCHLAEFLI: Yes, can you hear me? Can you hear
 7
    me?
 8
          MAYOR MINTO: Yes, yes.
 9
          MR. SCHLAEFLI: Wonderful. Thank you. Sorry,
     earlier. Tried connecting through the phone now, so it
10
11
     should work. Mayor and Council, thank you again for
12
    hearing me tonight. Fanita Ranch has obviously been a
     topic for many, many years. In its current form, though,
13
14
     I think we have a winner. I want to thank the City
15
     Council for the wisdom they displayed in a near unanimous
16
     vote, in favor of Fanita Ranch. I hope that trend
     continues tonight, as this project is -- is absolutely
17
     critical for our City.
18
19
               I also want to thank City Staff, Planning,
20
     Public Works, Engineering, traffic. They've done a
21
     fantastic job getting their arms around what is perhaps
22
     the largest expansion in the City's history, and
23
     certainly one of the largest projects in City history.
     You know, the -- the -- the countless workshops, the
24
25
     devotion to transparency with the public and providing
```

2.0

information to the public is truly a credit to the City,
and I think Staff has done a fantastic job on that, and I
did wanna thank them.

I also wanna congratulate HomeFed. They are a fantastic developer and I think we're going to get a very high-quality, fantastic development in Fanita Ranch. What sold me on Fanita Ranch, you know, although, I -- I'm very excited about the addition to the City and the -- the fantastic new homes and farm and all the other things is the roadway improvement.

And you know, I'm very disheartened to see that -- that Measure N puts those at risk, puts that -- this important vote and this asset for the City, as well as all the numerous roadway improvements at risk, as well as endangering other businesses in the City of Santee and expansion of businesses and ability to have smart growth principle supply. And -- and that's why I'll be opposing Measure N. I think that's short-sided.

And the signature gathering effort to immediately, you know, without even waiting for the second hearing or Second Reading of the Ordinance or anything else, without really digesting the facts in the record, this knee-jerk, oh, let's go and get a whole bunch of signatures and to -- to repeal the -- the Fanita Ranch approval. It's disheartening to see this

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

constantly happen and these threats of lawsuits and these high-pressure tactics and the constant lies. You know, I was going to the grocery store the other day and had a signature gatherer practically accost me, saying, "Well, you don't like traffic, do you?" Well, of course I don't like traffic. Nobody likes traffic, but that's not what this development is about. This development's really about fixing traffic -- traffic, if anything.

But there's a lot of frustration and I -- and I hope that we, as a City, can grow. And I hope that these opponents, who are constantly just opposed to any sort of progress in the City think again about the tactics that they're using. I think the people of Santee see through

progress in the City think again about the tactics that they're using. I think the people of Santee see through them and we don't appreciate it. So thank you, City Council, thank you, Staff, for all your hard work on this

project. Glad to finally have this one -- this approval

behind us.

CITY CLERK: I'm sorry, Mayor Minto. No further speakers on these items. Hold on, we're working on it.

MAYOR MINTO: Okay. There we go. That's one way of shutting me up, I guess, you muting me. So all right then, thank you very much to the speakers. And we'll go to Council comments. Ronn, do you have anything for us?

COUNCILMEMBER HALL: (No audible response.)

MAYOR MINTO: Are you muted, also?

```
1
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: (No audible response.)
 2.
         MAYOR MINTO: Everyone's muted?
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL:
                               I'm fine now.
 3
 4
     (Unintelligible). She unmuted me.
          MAYOR MINTO: Okay.
 5
 6
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: So here's -- here's my problem
 7
     with the -- the Fanita people disagreeing with it is --
     and I said this last time, and people, I don't think are
 8
 9
     really understanding where it's coming from is,
     regardless -- from what I'm understanding, regardless of
10
11
    N passing, regardless of the petition going through --
12
     and I'd like clarification from the City Attorney and
     anybody else that would be willing to clarify it -- they
13
14
     can build 1300 houses, 1380 houses. I said this two
15
     weeks ago and I'm saying it again: From what I
16
     understand, they can build 1380 houses, regardless. No
    matter what happens, they can build those. So those are
17
     gonna -- those can be built tomorrow, as long as they set
18
19
     it up.
20
               I got a hold of the League of Cities, and I've
     got all the laws from the last two years, since 2018,
21
22
     about affordable housing. These are just affordable
23
    housing and additional dwelling units. Basically, granny
     flats. So here we are, with all these laws, being told
24
25
     we have to do them, from the State of California, and
```

they're demanding we do these. They can take this 1380 1 2. houses, they can add two additional dwelling units --3 nothing we can do about this -- and they -- at that 4 point, we're at 4,000, along with the -- that's 2760, 5 plus the 1380, you're at 4140. I brought that up last 6 time. And I kinda dropped it. Well, today, I'm not 7 gonna drop it. Today I'm gonna bring it up. 8 I wanna know from somebody, opposition, 9 regardless, can those house -- will those houses -- or can those houses go in? So if N passes -- if the 10 11 petition going on right now passes, what happens to those 12

houses? From what I understand, they can put them up

tomorrow. We have no fire department. We have no 13

sheriff's help. We have no road help. We have no 52

15 help. So we just get 4,000 houses, and they just throw

16 them in there and say, thanks, see you later.

Then, the other part of that is, they could put a bus stop up there -- similar to what we have at Town Center, if you look at Town Center -- call it a hub, go down to MTS, divert the 834 bus, run it up to Fanita Ranch, run it back over to Town Center, and now we have a hub. Well, guess what you can do with a hub? You can put affordable housing in, 'cause it's a half mile from the -- from there. Well, what happens if Fanita Ranch just gets ticked off, to put it mildly, puts 4,000

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2.

2.0

2.4

affordable housing -- to go at 4,000 of the automatic they can put in now -- you're at 8,000 units.

So I guess my question is: How do you defend that? Where are we with that? Is there -- there's no proposition that'll defend it, from what I understand. And I'm asking Shawn, Melanie or Marlene to -- or Stephen, for that matter, give me an answer.

MAYOR MINTO: Shawn, do you want to address that?

CITY ATTORNEY HAGERTY: I will -- I'll respond and then Melanie can jump in, 'cause it's really more in Melanie's shot. But -- but the Councilmember is -- is correct, in the sense that the current General Plan, as you know from the previous project, allows the development of up to that -- the number -- the 13 whatever number that the Councilmember mentioned, under the current General Plan. And that would not be affected by the various referendums or initiatives that are being circulated.

So if an application were filed, consistent with the current General Plan, that would be something that would be consistent with the -- with the -- the current General Plan, wouldn't require a General Plan change. I think Melanie can comment on the other aspects of the question.

DIRECTOR KUSH: Thank you, Shawn. So Shawn just

2.

laid the -- the groundwork. Our -- our housing element already acknowledges the construction of 1300 and -- actually, 1395 units. Fifteen of those are live/work units. And I'm referring to the Barratt American approval, at the time.

So because it's in our housing element, and in our General Plan, it is -- it is allowed and there is really no rationale for denying that, without making extreme findings, unlikely to be made. The -- the lots that are supporting the 1380 units are large lots. They were, at the time, intended to be move-up estate housing, mimicking what the City of Poway has done. For a very long time, that was the vision for Fanita Ranch.

Today, not so much. Today it's a compact development, with smaller lots, for the most part. We do have lots that, in Fanita Ranch, could conceivably add, even with their approval, accessory dwelling units, if there was room for that.

But certainly, under the Barratt American plan, it is conceivable that a property owner would like to put two additional dwelling units on the property, as Councilmember Hall said, granny flats, we call them accessory dwelling units. And -- and we, as a City, would not have the ability to deny an application for an accessory dwelling unit, under state law. So, yes, the

```
number of units could be multiplied, significantly, under
1
 2.
     the -- the old Barratt American plan, and potentially
     even a little bit more, under the HomeFed plan, but the
 3
 4
     way that Specific Plan has been developed, it makes it
 5
     less possible.
 6
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Okay. Could you elaborate on
     SB-35 and affordable units, if there's a hub there.
 7
 8
          DIRECTOR KUSH: So if there's a hub, then there is
 9
     an effort under -- under way to create a California
     Environmental Quality Act exemption for development of
10
11
     affordable housing, within -- you said half a mile,
     Councilmember Hall, it might even be a guarter mile of
12
     that hub. Either way, it would be -- it would be
13
14
    possible to -- to increase the density around a transit
15
    hub. And that would be contingent upon a developer
16
    proposing something to us and -- and us -- and you know,
17
     taking a look at it, but difficult to deny. Our hands
     would be -- our scope would be limited, you are correct.
18
19
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: City Council could technically
2.0
    not deny that, if it was done properly?
21
          DIRECTOR KUSH: Correct.
22
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: And what is the limit that they
23
     would have, of affordable housing units, if everything
    was done correctly?
2.4
          DIRECTOR KUSH: Oh, I -- I don't have enough
25
```

```
1
     information to answer that question, sir.
 2.
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: But they -- but I know that
     they were talking they could go five stories at one
 3
 4
    point. John can probably refer to that a little bit
 5
    better than me or -- or me refer to that a little more.
 6
     But basically, what I'm -- I'm saying is: This argument
 7
     that we're having about Fanita Ranch is there, but the
 8
     reality is, the houses can go in either way. We have no
 9
     control over those houses. Would the 52 development --
     the $40 million they promised put in the 52, would that
10
11
    be considered under the -- the "Barratt" plan?
12
          DIRECTOR KUSH: No, it -- it would not. The -- the
     improvement to the 52 is reflected in the Development
13
14
     Agreement between the City and HomeFed.
15
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Right. And -- and again, if N
16
    passes, that still could go through, correct?
          DIRECTOR KUSH: When you say, "Go through," you
17
18
    mean -- you mean --
19
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: The Barratt plan would still be
2.0
    available?
21
          DIRECTOR KUSH: No. I -- I don't -- if I'm
22
     interpreting your question, it would not be available.
23
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Okay. Well, Shawn just said it
    would be.
2.4
25
         DIRECTOR KUSH: Okay.
```

```
1
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: So (Unintelligible) --
 2
         DIRECTOR KUSH: So please have Shawn answer that
     question. I may be reversing the question.
 3
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: He's -- he's already answered
 4
 5
     it.
         That's okay. So that's fine. He's already answered
 6
     it. 'Cause you're saying it's already in the General
 7
    Plan.
          DIRECTOR KUSH: That -- yes, the -- the --
 8
 9
         COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Oh, (Unintelligible) --
         DIRECTOR KUSH: -- the 1395 units in the General
10
11
     Plan.
12
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: So that's fine. So -- so,
     really, what we're having here is an argument whether you
13
14
     wanna have a plan, a special unit development --
15
     whatever -- I apologize for the wording on it -- or a
16
    planned development, and either way, they could be built?
17
         DIRECTOR KUSH: Yes.
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Okay. So the reality is, we're
18
19
     sitting here arguing with each other over houses that are
2.0
     gonna be built either way?
21
         DIRECTOR KUSH: Yes.
22
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: All right. Any other -- that's
23
    pretty much it. I just wanted to make my point. So
24
     anybody got any comments, I'm more than happy to hear
25
     them.
```

2.4

1 MAYOR MINTO: Stephen.

COUNCILMEMBER HOULAHAN: Well, I have two -- two major concerns. The first is the process, and it's a terrible thing to have citizens calling in and saying they're being accosted, while they're trying to express their First Amendment Rights to freedom of speech and to have individuals interfering and to have people who are agents of an outside force to disrupt them practicing the democratic process.

So that's a major concern. And we should all be able to join together and denounce that activity. So that -- that should be the obvious thing first is whether there's a difference of opinion or not, we should be able to allow the democratic process to carry itself out. And so, I would say that having these outside forces coming in, that seem to be very heavily funded --

MAYOR MINTO: Stephen, can I --

COUNCILMEMBER HOULAHAN: -- and then to be taking aim at people seems -- that's a -- that's a major problem right now. So my very first concern is this process issue.

MAYOR MINTO: Stephen, but can you -- can you stay on this 8 and 9, and we can address that at another time.

COUNCILMEMBER HOULAHAN: Well, I think it -- it's integral to what's going on now. So the fact that the

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

citizens are standing up for themselves, and they have the right to speak. And so as far as what's going on with issues 8 and 9, the people have attempted to have Measure N for, which you may or may not believe in, but again, they should have their -- their freedom to express themselves, whether they support it or not. And so, to have individuals to come in and try to suppress their voice is unacceptable. And again, the entire Council should be able to denounce that at this time, because it's not okay. So --MAYOR MINTO: Okay. Stephen --COUNCILMEMBER HOULAHAN: -- again, let them -- let them do what they wanna do. And if they wanna speak freely, then they should be allowed to do so. And I would ask directly, at this time, that HomeFed and their agents stand down and leave the volunteers alone, while

they're attempting to collect referendum signatures,

because it's -- it's completely unacceptable and this

19 behavior must stop immediately.

MAYOR MINTO: Okay. We're gonna -- we're gonna -- we're --

COUNCILMEMBER HOULAHAN: And then -- now, let me talk about Ronn and -- and Ronn's question, since he decided to speak to me directly. And so I -- I understand that this is a -- a issue that's been fought

2.

over for 30 years, absolutely, and has a long, long
history. And there was a a council plan that was
approved, back in the '90s. And again, there was a
referendum that overturned that decision, at that time.
And at that time, there probably was the same sort of
plan and houses could've been built at that time, also,
but they weren't, because it was the will of the people
at the time.
Now, bring forward another decade and the
Barratt American plan comes forth, and it was approved by
the City Council. However, it was struck down, under
environmental review, by the administrative law judge.
And so, although, in the General Plan, it does have that
element, the current Barratt American plan was struck
down and and so that is why the plan was never built.

However, now, we are at this crossroads with the current Fanita Ranch plan, which is significantly larger than the 1395 homes that may or may not be able to be built tomorrow, that could've been built, apparently for the last 20 years, but have not been.

And so, now, we're looking at a -- a project that's vastly larger, that has the potential to swell the population of Santee by upwards of 10 percent. And

all speak when it's our time.

2.

again, I brought up my concerns in the last meeting, at the first attempt at this, the first reading, that the fire mitigation plan is -- is -- is just not acceptable.

Now, there was talk of a possible reverse -- or a route for escape that could've led to Eucalyptus Hills. It should've been insisted upon. It should've been a portion of it absolute, because the current evacuation plan is unacceptable. And having lost the Magnolia Extension, again, is unacceptable. The plan for Cuyamaca, changing the left turn lanes at El Nopal and Woodglen Vista, that's unacceptable. And so, we need a better plan. So having made that change at the last minute, again, was unacceptable.

So now, let's talk about traffic, as far as on a day-to-day basis. Yes, there is a break in traffic, with COVID-19 restrictions. However, I drive to work and there still is traffic, and it -- so a lot of us are back to work, thank God.

Now, as far as the mitigation plan for the traffic on the 52, it's not my understanding that it's fully funded. And so, I have major concerns about promises that could be left unfulfilled. So the fact that the people of Santee are spending upwards of \$5,000 a month for a lobbyist, in Washington D.C., for which we, as a Council, have approved, again, that may or may not

2.

bring the fruits of that labor back to Santee to fund the 52 improvements that are greatly underfunded.

And so, hopefully, we'll be able to get the matching funds from -- from SANDAG as well. So again, I -- I don't see the funding plan there. The -- the promise of not occupying one home is not good enough. I wanna see the funding plan.

Now, last time I -- I didn't talk about the water issues. It seems to me that with these plan vineyards that'll be kind of on the periphery, I believe that it's gonna take a lot of water and I believe, at some point, the HOA would have to really take on a lot of expense to keep vineyards and orchards all on the end of a very arid -- a very arid area.

And so, I have concerns about water and the hydrology of the area. As far as, also, the aspects of additional sewage being pumped into the Padre Dam. And so we're gonna be doing a great service to the East County, but we're gonna be bringing in upwards, you know, 15,000 gallons a day or something of sewage that has a malodorous discharge, that goes directly to this property, in question. We didn't even talk about it. I guess there'll be someone to sign -- they'll sign away the rights.

Finally, talking about the military flying over

1 that area. We -- we had a -- a lot of difficulty getting 2. the Stowe Trail opened. The -- the Marines were very 3 worried about people being out in that area just -- and 4 having to have a clearance, for which I have undergone 5 multiple times. And so, now we're putting a lot of 6 people there. There's jets, soon to be some of the -some of the most high tech and most sophisticated 7 aircraft in U.S. history will be flying over that area as 8 9 well. So we -- we -- we completely missed on talking about noise mitigation, and as far as the smell and water 10 11 issues. 12 And then, as -- as much as the 10-year buildout, there's gonna be a significant, significant 13 14 amount of construction traffic. So again, we can talk 15

buildout, there's gonna be a significant, significant amount of construction traffic. So again, we can talk about, you know, the -- the plan will be approved, because it can be approved and they could put a, you know, accessory dwelling units. Then, let's let the people vote and -- and if it turns out they can bring forward that plan, then let them bring forward that plan. But this plan has major holes in it.

I would make a motion that we -- that we continue and wait on this vote and not do the Second Reading today. Allow the people to go through the democratic process to vote. And if -- if you really hate Measure A that much, then -- then campaign against it and

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2.

2.0

stop it and -- and don't let outside agents do so, and let the people speak. Let it go to a vote. My motion is to -- to not pass tonight and to carry this until after the election of November 3rd.

MAYOR MINTO: Is there a second to that motion? I'm not hearing any. That will die for a lack of second, Steve. Thank you. All right. You know, I'm gonna just make couple comments, too, to -- actually, to Ronn's comments, also. And senate -- Senator Scott Wiener is the one that authored these bills in California to create what they call ministerial acts, and basically allow certain projects to go through, without actually any kind of action on a City Council or Planning Commission. And they do have to do with affordable housing, especially, and they are within a quarter mile of any kind of bus stop.

So if -- if they wanted to, they could just expand where they put bus stops and create five-story homes, with multiple house -- multiple living units in them. Scott Wiener continues to attempt to expand that and include more and more housing, without the actions of Council. The only thing that Council can do is make sure that they approve the building permits so that they are compliant with state and local ordinances. So -- so, Ronn, you're absolutely right about the -- our ability to

```
not stop any kind of housing that wants to go in there,
 1
     that complies with these state mandates. So -- so that's
 2.
 3
     certainly a concern of ours, also. I'm gonna go on --
 4
    Rob, do you have anything?
 5
          COUNCILMEMBER McNELIS: (No audible response.)
 6
         MAYOR MINTO: Okay.
 7
          COUNCILMEMBER McNELIS: All right. So I -- I just
     gotta start off by saying, I find it sincerely
 8
 9
     disingenuous that someone talks about First Amendment
     Rights, you know, people to signature gather and do all
10
11
     that stuff, but forgets that First Amendment Rights mean
12
     you have the ability to say what -- how you feel, so --
13
    but you want to infringe upon other people's First
14
     Amendment Rights to not support this -- this theoretical
15
     initiative. That's completely disingenuous. You can't
16
    have it both ways. It's either you have First Amendment
17
    Rights or you don't. So we are --
18
          MAYOR MINTO: Hey, Rob, it's not the --
19
          COUNCILMEMBER McNELIS: I get it. I'm going.
20
     going. All right. So I'm on 8 and 9, but thank you.
21
     The -- the issue is that this measure, Measure N, does
22
    not -- does not talk about Fanita Ranch in any way. I
     said it before, the author of Measure N, since it was
23
24
     qualified, has voted two times against the project that
25
     would -- against -- or sorry, voted two times on projects
```

2.

that would be in direct violation of Measure N.

So to me, this means that Measure N is either flawed or the author is being hypocritical. Don't know which, but you guys can decide. Fanita legally opens thousands of acres of trails, 35 miles of trails to all citizens of the City of Santee. It actually fixes the 50 -- Highway 52 and the ramp at -- at Mast and 52. It widens that so that more people can cue up and get them off of Mast, right in front of the high school, right in front of Westin and onto the freeway in a -- in a easier manner.

If they don't do that, you should be -- God, you should be blessed if they don't do that. If they -- 'cause if they don't actually make that finally happen -- if it takes 20 years for that to happen for them to raise the money, they don't sell one house. They can't close on any homes.

So we get all the infrastructure being done.

We get all the -- the benefits of it, and we have no addition to the population, which is what many people -- or some people, I should say, seem to -- to want. So I -- I really don't understand that argument of saying that, oh, well, I don't believe that there's enough money for it. Fine. You should be happy. If there isn't enough money for it, then they can't build any houses.

Fire safety was brought up. Fire safety actually increases. They have -- we will have much larger fire breaks and we will have a housing stock that is built of today -- with today's technology. Some of the most incredibly fire retardant materials are going to be utilized, in this development, that will now surround the outer banks of our city, so that if -- if there is any kind of fire that came in from outside those -- the -- in -- in the planes, in the prairies out there that we've got, we now have a true fire break, and we have a housing stock that could actually withstand this and defend against the old housing stock that can't do that.

The exit plans, exit strategies that are -that were proposed or that are -- that are gonna be
utilized are -- have been vetted out by our fire chief,
by nationally renowned fire experts. This is -- this is
the new world. We -- we don't -- we are not Paradise.
We don't have shake shingle roofs anymore. We don't live
in the center of a forest. This is not that, and to try
and -- to try and pander to people and -- and -- and
scare them with those types of tactics and saying those
types of things, it's -- it's just insincere. It's
not -- it's not right.

This also helps with a full spectrum of housing

2.

stock. This -- this project will provide multiple different types of housing that will allow new citizens to come into Santee and become part of our community. It'll also allow the citizens that have been here a full cycle of housing from condos, to get started, to move-up housing, to senior and retirement housing so that they can stay in Santee and continue to -- to live here, while at the same time, freeing up some of the older housing stock that allows new families to get started and get theirs started.

It was said earlier, "I've got mine, I don't want you to have yours." That's basically what this all sounds like to me. And by the way, every house that you live in that was built in Santee, somebody said that about your development as well. This is -- this is the way life is. If you don't -- you have to grow in some form or fashion. I think this is smart growth.

It was brought up that Magnolia -- that the fire -- the fire issues with Magnolia. Magnolia, just to get it on the record, Magnolia was not scheduled to even be extended for 15 years, 15 years into the development. It wasn't gonna be Day 1. It's not -- it's -- but guess what? No homes are gonna be built Day 1. It's probably gonna take at least five years, if not six, before the very first home could even potentially be built. And

2.

then, we've got -- it was, I think 1600 homes had to be built before Magnolia was even thought about going through the first time. As a community, as a City, we could -- we can still make that happen. We should make that happen within that period of time.

And Stephen you -- you said you're worried about water, noise, odor, all those types of things, the -- the -- the planes flying over, that's stuff that the consumer, when they decide to buy, they will be notified of. If they don't wanna buy it, if they -- then it won't be built. These -- they don't build thousands of homes and then say, okay, now let's go try and sell them. That's not the way this works.

They build three, four, five homes at a time, sell them off and then they build the next phase. And that's the reason that this is a 20-year buildout, most likely, is because this -- they -- they don't do it the way that it was done back in the -- in the '90s.

So if buyers don't want the housing stock, they will change that housing stock. But guess what? Once again, all the development will -- all the -- all the prerequisite development will be done. The 52 would've been widened by then. The on-ramp will be done. We'll have money for smart signaling, throughout the entire City of Santee to help our traffic concerns and the

```
1
     congestion.
 2.
               So you should be happy if people don't wanna do
     that, because this housing -- I mean, all the
 3
 4
     infrastructure will already be done and it'll delay that
    max capacity of 30 -- of 3,000 homes to 30 years, maybe.
 5
 6
     But that's -- that's the buyer's decision. It's not your
 7
    decision to say, Well, I don't think that people will
     wanna do that, so I'm gonna say no. That's -- that's
 8
 9
     their decision and that's why the price will reflect what
     the market will bear.
10
               So with that, I actually will make the motion
11
     to support 8 and 9 -- or support Staff recommendation for
12
     8 and 9. Thank you.
13
14
          MAYOR MINTO: Thank you. Is there a second for
     that?
15
16
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: I'll go ahead and second it.
17
    didn't know if Laura wanted to talk first to it.
          MAYOR MINTO: Well, we can still have the
18
19
    discussion, even though. So I do have a first and I do
2.0
    have a second. And so Laura, did you --
          COUNCILMEMBER HALL: I'd like to have a comment
21
     towards the end, too, just a quick comment.
22
23
          MAYOR MINTO: Okay.
          VICE MAYOR KOVAL: You can go ahead --
2.4
25
          MAYOR MINTO: Let's -- let's (Unintelligible).
```

1 VICE MAYOR KOVAL: -- and make it now. 2. MAYOR MINTO: Go ahead. COUNCILMEMBER HALL: You know, when this -- this 3 4 whole 8 and 9 first came out, I wasn't really a fan 5 either way of it. But I think they've worked their way 6 through it. Our job is loss mitigation or -- and making sure that we got the best deal there is. 7 8 My whole comments earlier were about what if. 9 What if we get the worst deal there is? You know, Padre Dam, I've done enough work with Padre Dam, where they 10 have to develop water. They're looking for that sewage 11 12 to come in and -- and work on it. They have -they're -- they're actually excited about it. They 13 14 wanted to -- and I think Laura can probably address that. 15 They can address that big time. 16 But basically, this is the best deal we're gonna get. Now, those houses are gonna go in either way. 17 We have a choice now to get the best deal -- and we've 18 19 done this on many occasions -- the best deal now or live 2.0 with the consequences. So that's all I had. 21 MAYOR MINTO: Laura. 22 VICE MAYOR KOVAL: Sure. Thank you. I -- I don't want to hash it all out again. I think we all know where 23 we stand and -- and it appears nothing has changed. 24 25 If -- if people listening want to hear my public comments

2.

2.0

from Fanita Ranch, go to about hour four of the past agenda, and that's where they start. There's also some very informative testimony from experts, especially for those that are worried about a "fire trap." So I would encourage you to listen to the experts. Like I said, it's about hour four on the public comment -- or in the comments from the last agenda.

As far as Magnolia goes, I -- I did ask that the Council -- or that the Staff, at some point, bring back a traffic mitigation plan, because we are, with the Development Services Agreement, we will get an extra \$5 million for traffic mitigation in -- in the City of Santee, which could include Magnolia.

And Ronn, you're right, I -- I did attend the Water Board meeting where Fanita Ranch was discussed, in great detail. And as I recall, the last Council meeting, we had the Director of Engineering for the Water District, online to answer any calls, but the Water Board voted 5 to 0 to approve the water allocation. This is not a -- they're agnostic, as far as development. All they're there to do is vote on, can this move forward?

And their decision was also based on just the infrastructure that the -- that the Water District has right now, so it wasn't considering the advanced water purification as treatment center. But as we all know

2.

now, that is moving forward as well. That's a East County project. And you're right, Ronn, they -- they would gladly take the sewer, because they're gonna make it into drinkable water and -- and what a great thing to have water reliability in East County and 30 percent of our water needs met right here. It's a -- you know, City of Santee imports 100 percent of their water, so this will be -- they'll be able to make 30 percent of our drinkable water. What a great project.

And -- and I came up with a -- not the NIMBYs, because we definitely know they're the Not In My Backyard people for sure, as -- as I expressed last time, my home is in the original Rancho Fanita development, from the 1950s and so everybody north of, you know, this development is -- is -- is a new development, right?

But now there's the NIMNBYS, which is Not In My New Backyard, and that's just -- it's just so ironic. I just can't wrap my head around it, but that's where we're at. And we are elected to make fair decisions, based on the facts and -- and for, you know -- and I know we've all spent a lot, a lot of time looking at -- at tons and tons of worksheets that -- or documents and going through a lot of workshops and we've been working on this for a good solid year. Some people a lot longer than that, so you know, I'm ready to vote.

MAYOR MINTO: Thank you. You know, I don't really want to go into a whole lot either. All I know is that we're required, by law, to hear projects that come before us, and we can't just tell people that have -- that are owners of property, No, we don't wanna hear your project, because quite frankly, then, no one would ever hear a project.

And so, whether you have a project that is 2600 acres or you have one that's half an acre, you have a right to be heard. You have a right to be heard fairly. You have a right to present your evidence and give testimony, and that's what we did at the last Council meeting.

Each one of us had the opportunity to ask the tough questions. I know I asked as many tough questions as I possibly could, and they were all answered by experts. Experts in the field of everything from biology to fire. And I can tell you right now that I don't believe any of these people got into this business because they didn't care about the environment, they didn't care about the fire or anything else.

So they did every bit of hard work they could to make sure that they did mitigate and find ways to mitigate. Especially when I'm talk -- when I hear them talking about, you know, butterfly or whatever it was

```
that hadn't been in Santee since 2004, but we're gonna
1
 2.
     make sure that the land can, you know, sustain them if
 3
     they come back some day. You know, that's not somebody
 4
     who's just willy-nilly, you know, saying, I don't care
 5
     about the environment, let's go ahead and build over it.
 6
               You know, it's not my job to care whether or
 7
    not something gets built or not, it's just to follow the
8
     law, and that's what we did in this case here.
 9
               And so I'm in support of the motion. I think
     we need to move forward. We're gonna let the voters
10
11
     eventually sort this all out. And then, once that
    happens, then we'll have a whole 'nother set of rules to
12
     follow. And then, when it comes back to us, we'll act
13
14
     appropriately within the law and within the scope of what
15
     we're supposed to do. All right. I will go ahead and
16
     call for the question here. And I'm gonna call Stephen.
17
     Yes or no?
18
          COUNCILMEMBER HOULAHAN: No.
19
         MAYOR MINTO: Thank you. Laura.
2.0
         VICE MAYOR KOVAL: Aye.
21
         MAYOR MINTO: Rob.
22
          COUNCILMEMBER McNELIS: Yes, sir.
23
         MAYOR MINTO: Ronn.
2.4
         COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Yes.
25
         MAYOR MINTO: And I also vote yes. Let the record
```

```
reflect that Items 8 and 9 are passed by a 4 to 1 vote,
1
    with 1 -- 4 ayes and 1 no. Does that cover that
 2
     appropriately, Shawn?
 3
          CITY ATTORNEY HAGERTY: Yes, Mayor.
 4
          MAYOR MINTO: Thank you very much.
 5
 6
                                -000-
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                               41
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Krisha Alatorre, a transcriber and court
4	reporter for Barrett Reporting, do hereby certify:
5	That said tape recordings were listened to by
6	me and were transcribed into typewriting under my
7	direction and supervision; and I hereby certify that the
8	foregoing transcript of the tape recordings is a full,
9	true, and correct transcript, to the best of my ability.
10	I further certify that I am neither counsel for
1	nor related to any party to said action, not in any way
L2	interested in the outcome thereof.
L 3	In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed
L 4	my name this 20th day of October, 2020.
L 5	
L 6	
L 7	
L 8	
L 9	
20	Krisha Alatorre
21	Krisha Alatorre
22	CSR No. 13255
23	
24	
25	