

FALLBROOK COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
P. O. Box 1419
Fallbrook, CA 92088

Open Letter to the San Diego County Board of Supervisors

Terra Lawson- Remer District 3/Chair
Monica Montgomery Steppe- District 4/Vice Chair
Paloma Aguirre, District 1/Chair ProTem
Joel Anderson, District 2
Jim Desmond, District 5

March 16 2026

There are over 500,000 residents in the County's unincorporated areas. County Planning Groups are elected by those residents to represent them and advise the County on land use issues. Sponsor Groups are appointed for the same purpose. So it was shocking when the will of these residents was completely ignored at the January 14, 2026 meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

At this meeting the Socially Equitable Cannabis Program was presented to the Supervisors by Staff for their direction on three options in the Draft Environmental Report (DEIR). There was also a fourth option which was to discontinue the Program.

Planning and Sponsor Groups have consistently voiced opposition to this Program, which is being forced on all of the unincorporated areas in the County of San Diego.

This program would give those who have convictions and were affected by the war on drugs preferential treatment and grants to start cannabis businesses in the unincorporated areas. It would allow outdoor cultivation, labs, dispensaries, consumption lounges, events and other cannabis related businesses in the entire unincorporated San Diego County.

During lengthy public testimony, documented safety, health and environmental impacts were presented based on CEQA and the County's own DEIR. The purpose of CEQA is to prevent significant, avoidable environmental damage by requiring changes in projects, either by the adoption of alternatives or imposition of mitigation measures.

None the less, the majority of Supervisors not only directed Staff to develop the option that according to their own Draft Environmental Impact Report would have the most environmental impacts, but disregarded the overwhelming opposition to this Program from the residents who will suffer the environmental and safety impacts that this Program will bring.

To be clear, the opposition is not about marijuana itself. It is not about using marijuana. This is legal in the state of California. Most of the Planning Groups are not opposed to dispensaries. This is about two separate issues. 1. Equity for those affected by the war on drugs and 2. Land use and the negative environmental impacts on the residents who live in some of the most beautiful land in our State. Land use and the negative impacts are our concerns.

The opposition is about the land use issues which would allow outdoor marijuana grows; large commercial cultivation close to residential areas. The extremely harmful environmental impacts have been documented in other regions which have legalized cannabis cultivation. It is also about the potential rise in crime, health and safety issues that have also been well documented, as well as the dangers that consumption lounges and events (impaired drivers) will bring to the rural and semi rural towns.

Planning Groups supported a reasonable alternative that would only allow indoor cultivation to help environmental and health concerns; greater buffers/setbacks with more sensitive locations like parks, trails and churches. It would remove the consumption lounges and events which are the most damaging to public safety (impaired drivers). Incredibly, the majority of Supervisors completely ignored this alternative. This reasonable compromise would substantially lessen the programs land use and safety impacts and would meet most of the basic program's objectives.

However, it appeared that the majority of Supervisors had already made their decision and their only concern was for those affected by the war on drugs, not the residents who live in the areas that will be affected.

Supervisors, there is still time to revise your direction and establish your goal of a Socially Equitable Cannabis Program. We are not being unreasonable. We are simply asking for more environmental and public health and safety guardrails to protect the half a million residents, especially the most vulnerable children and seniors who live in the beautiful unincorporated San Diego County.

Respectfully,

Fallbrook Community Planning Group

[REDACTED]

From: [Devon Foster](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#); [Potter, Andrew](#); [BOS, District1Community](#); [WaterfrontPark](#); [DPW, Special Event Permit](#); [mayor@sandiego.gov](#); [REDACTED]; [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#); [Lue, Askparks](#); [Lima, Melanie](#); [REDACTED]; [a.go](#); [Benham, Crystal](#)
Subject: [External] Complaint Regarding CRSSD Festival at Waterfront Park – Noise, Public Nuisance, and Park Damage
Date: Sunday, March 15, 2026 7:35:13 PM

To the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors and Parks & Recreation Department,

I am writing to formally express concern regarding the continued authorization of the CRSSD music festival at Waterfront Park. While residents understand and support reasonable public events in our shared civic spaces, CRSSD has repeatedly created conditions that substantially interfere with the surrounding community's ability to use and enjoy their homes and neighborhood. No other concert at this venue has been an issue to the level CRSSD is every single time.

Under California law, a nuisance is defined as anything “injurious to health...or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property.” (California Civil Code §3479). A public nuisance is one that affects “an entire community or neighborhood, or any considerable number of persons.” (California Civil Code §3480). The conditions associated with CRSSD meet both of these statutory definitions.

The event produces unusually loud and persistent amplified music from multiple stages throughout the day and evening. According to permit documentation associated with the event, amplified sound and related activities can occur for extended periods tied to event setup and operations, demonstrating that the impacts extend beyond the performance hours themselves. The event regularly attracts approximately 15,000 attendees per day and utilizes multiple stages with amplified sound. These conditions create noise that is clearly audible throughout the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

In addition to the general nuisance concerns described above, the noise produced by this event raises questions regarding compliance with local noise regulations. San Diego Municipal Code §59.5.0401 establishes maximum permissible sound levels measured at the receiving property line, including limits as low as 50 decibels during the daytime and 40 decibels during nighttime hours for residential areas. County park regulations further restrict amplified sound within county parks, providing that sound amplification devices may not exceed 90 decibels measured 50 feet from the source and must comply with noise limits measured at the park boundary unless specifically permitted under controlled conditions. These regulations exist to protect the surrounding community from excessive and disruptive noise impacts.

Despite these legal standards, the CRSSD festival routinely generates amplified sound that is clearly audible across surrounding residential neighborhoods for extended periods. Because other concerts and events held at Waterfront Park do not produce similar disturbances, it appears that either the event operator is not complying with applicable sound limitations or the conditions of the event permit are not being enforced with the same rigor applied to other events.

Importantly, CRSSD is the only event at Waterfront Park that consistently produces these impacts. Other concerts and permitted activities at the park occur without noticeable disturbance to residents. This demonstrates that events can be conducted responsibly at this

location when organizers follow appropriate standards. The persistent disruption associated with CRSSD strongly suggests either that the operator is not being held to the same standards as other event producers or that the operator is failing to comply with those standards.

The impacts extend well beyond noise. Each year the park is left heavily damaged after the festival due to the scale of the crowd and staging infrastructure. Waterfront Park—intended as a public recreational space—is then closed for an extended period while turf and landscaping recover. This deprives residents and visitors of access to a public asset that is supposed to be open and usable year-round.

Additionally, the event routinely produces severe post-event disturbances in the surrounding neighborhood. Attendees leaving the festival are frequently intoxicated and congregate throughout the adjacent residential streets and public spaces. Residents regularly encounter individuals urinating or defecating in public areas and on private property, creating unsanitary conditions and further degrading the neighborhood environment.

This is particularly troubling given that Waterfront Park itself is governed by county park regulations designed to protect public health, safety, and proper use of the park. For example, County ordinances regulate park use and prohibit activities such as unauthorized alcohol consumption and conduct inconsistent with the intended recreational use of the park.

If the County wishes to continue permitting CRSSD at Waterfront Park, the operator should be held to significantly stricter standards. At minimum:

1. The operator should be required to pay full rental and restoration costs for the entire period during which Waterfront Park is unavailable to the public due to event-related damage, repairs, or grass regrowth.
2. Noise limits and monitoring requirements should be strictly enforced, consistent with the standards applied to other events at the park.
3. Enhanced sanitation, security, and post-event crowd management should be required to prevent public intoxication and unsanitary conditions in surrounding residential areas.
4. Consideration should be given to relocating the event to a venue designed for high-volume electronic music festivals rather than a neighborhood park.

Waterfront Park is a valuable public amenity intended for everyday community use. Allowing a single commercial festival to repeatedly degrade the park and disrupt surrounding neighborhoods is inconsistent with the County's responsibility to manage public land for the benefit of all residents.

I respectfully request that the County reconsider issuing future permits for CRSSD at Waterfront Park. If the event is allowed to continue, meaningful safeguards and financial accountability for park restoration and community impacts should be implemented.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Devon Foster
Little Italy resident and owner

From: [Jessie Vinje](#)
To: [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#); [Anderson, Joel](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [Desmond, Jim](#); [Aquirre, Paloma x](#); [Potter, Andrew](#); [FGG, Public Comment](#); [Worlie, Paul](#); [LaVelle, Kyle](#); [Hayes, Andrew](#); [Yuen, Jeffrey](#); [Henson, Eric](#); [McDonald, Hunter](#); [Lynch, Dahvia](#); [Harbert, Amy](#); [Slovick, Mark](#); [REDACTED]; [Lorenzana, Bianca](#); [Montagne, Sarah](#); [David C. McQuead](#); [REDACTED]; [Nicoletti, Vince](#)
Subject: [External] Prioritize Safety
Date: Thursday, March 12, 2026 9:14:52 AM

Dear Members of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you as a concerned resident and environmentalist regarding the proposed Harmony Grove Village South project. I urge you to reject this development, as it epitomizes urban sprawl that threatens to undo all the hard work the County has done on its Climate Action Plan and its efforts to limit sprawl and encourage infill.

The project is not served by transit and will increase the county's Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as it is significantly higher than the County-wide average. And it will generate more GHGs than it is claiming it can offset. In addition, during the next wildfire, the potential for gridlock will pose a serious risk to the nearby communities. Independent experts have shown that, due to inadequate secondary egress, it poses a serious entrapment risk. This is absolutely unacceptable in view of the recent Palisades and Altadena evacuation catastrophes.

Increased VMT and driving distances will lead to greater carbon emissions, more sprawl and further contribute to climate change. The community itself is mostly rural, known for its wildlife, open space reserves, and natural beauty. We must protect areas like this from irresponsible developments that prioritize profit over public safety and ecological integrity.

Additionally, the site is listed as a Priority Conservation Area in the Multiple Species Conservation Area (MSCP) North draft. It is directly adjacent to lands supporting state and federal endangered least Bell's vireo, federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher, the endangered Southwestern Willow flycatcher and near the Escondido Creek which supports the proposed federal threatened status Southwestern pond turtle.

The position of this project within the wildland urban interface (WUI) flies in the face of a wide body of research that shows that these are the communities that suffer the most losses during wildfire events. This community has already experienced the devastating effects of wildfires numerous times over the years (most recently, the Cocos Fire), with limited evacuation infrastructure.

I strongly urge you to consider the long-term implications of approving the Harmony Grove Village South project.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue.

Sincerely,
Jessie Vinje

From: [Mary Row](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] Concerns and Recommendations Regarding Dianne Jacob Equestrian Center Management
Date: Thursday, March 26, 2026 9:44:45 PM

Dear Chair and Members of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, and Supervisor Joel Anderson,

I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the current condition and management of the Dianne Jacob Equestrian Center. This facility has tremendous potential to serve the community as a vibrant, active, and even revenue-generating asset. Unfortunately, in its current state, it is falling far short of that potential.

At present, the facility is not meeting the needs of the local equestrian community. Access is limited, scheduling is inconsistent, and the arena footing is not safe or suitable for regular riding or competitive events. This creates a situation where community members are unable to use a public facility that was intended for their benefit.

Additionally, it appears that current management lacks experience in key disciplines such as rodeo, barrel racing, and western riding events—areas that are central to the interests of many local riders. As a result, the facility is not attracting events, and its calendar remains largely underutilized. This is a missed opportunity both for community engagement and for generating revenue.

With proper management and strategic improvements, this facility could become a thriving equestrian hub. I respectfully propose the following:

- Improve the arena footing and grounds to ensure safety and usability for both daily riding and events.
- Implement an inclusive annual membership program that allows riders regular access to the facility, ideally with flexible hours that accommodate varying schedules.
- Engage experienced equestrian event professionals who understand how to attract and manage rodeo, barrel racing, and western events.
- Benchmark successful community equestrian facilities across the country to adopt proven, sustainable operational models.

By addressing these issues, I believe the County would see a dramatic increase in community participation and interest. A well-run facility would naturally draw riders back, fill the event calendar, and attract producers eager to host competitions and events.

At this time, however, high costs combined with unsafe riding conditions are discouraging use and limiting the facility's impact. This is not what the community envisioned when the equestrian center was developed.

I urge the Board and Supervisor Anderson to take a closer look at the current operations and consider making the necessary changes to unlock this facility's full potential. With the right leadership and improvements, the Dianne Jacob Equestrian Center can become a valuable and thriving part of our community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Mary Row

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [C.Cotton](#)
To: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Government Affairs](#); [CouncilMember Joe LaCava](#); [Congressman Scott Peters](#)
Subject: [External] Re: Continued Items: 03/24/2026 and 03/25/2026 County of San Diego Board of Supervisors Agendas
Date: Wednesday, March 25, 2026 11:18:27 AM

Good Afternoon,

My apologies for the delayed response. Thank you for the updates.

I will let you know if I have questions or concerns about the General legislative line items (25-28); line items (20-25). Delayed but would like to include my input to this discussion.

Perhaps a broader discussion around tax incentives for our business registered landscaper, contracted landscaper with the City in lieu of what the Cesar Chavez movement stood for historically and the impact it had on the Mexican American and the Hispanic communities. Ensuring the legacy is not overshadowed with scandal which can be tied to every chapter of our American history

Thank You,
Cassandra Cotton

On Tue, Mar 24, 2026, 6:15 PM County of San Diego <sdcounty@service.govdelivery.com> wrote:

San Diego County



County of San Diego Board of Supervisors Meeting Agenda

You are subscribed to receive the [County of San Diego Board of Supervisors meeting agendas](#). Please see the agenda links below for the upcoming Board of Supervisors meeting.

Meeting Date: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 and Wednesday, March 25, 2026

The following agenda items were carried over from the March 24, 2026 General Legislative Session and will be considered on Wednesday, March 25, 2026 in the following anticipated order:

- 26. RECEIVE UPDATE AND PRESENTATION FROM THE AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SAFETY NET AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SYSTEMS TRANSFORMATION (TIME CERTAIN AT 9 A.M.)
- 27. RETURN BACK ON OPTIONS FOR ESTABLISHING A SAFETY NET BRIDGE PROGRAM TO ADDRESS ANTICIPATED GAPS IN SERVICES FOR RESIDENTS DISENROLLED FROM BENEFIT PROGRAMS AND AUTHORIZE IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING FOR A SAFETY NET BRIDGE PROGRAM PILOT
- 28. RECEIVE THE UPDATE ON CREATING A CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND TRANSITION AGE YOUTH BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CONTINUUM FRAMEWORK FOR SAN DIEGO COUNTY; AUTHORIZE COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENTS FOR BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SERVICES; DIRECT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DATA-SHARING AGREEMENTS AMONG COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO DEPARTMENTS; AND DIRECT FORMAL DISCUSSION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DATA-SHARING AGREEMENTS AMONG LOCAL HOSPITALS AND MANAGED CARE PLANS TO IMPROVE CARE COORDINATION FOR YOUTH IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY
- 20. ESTABLISHING A FRAMEWORK FOR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEES THAT DEMONSTRATES TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY
- 21. OPTIMIZING COUNTY FLEET MANAGEMENT TO CAPTURE MILLIONS IN ONGOING TAXPAYER SAVINGS