

*****SPECIAL NOTICE*****

To take part in the VIRTUAL meeting call in by phone at either 669-900-6833 Or 346-248-7799 starting at 7:15 pm.
When directed, enter the meeting ID: 825-8974-8600 and Meeting Password: 827443

You will be placed in a Queue until admitted by the Host. You will then be placed on hold until the Meeting begins. When it is your turn to speak, the host will say the last four digits of your phone number and you will be permitted to speak at that time.

If you become disconnected, call back and enter the appropriate ID and PW numbers.

*****SPECIAL NOTICE*****

**JAMUL DULZURA
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
FINAL MINUTES
Tuesday March 23, 2021**

APPROVED April 23, 2021

*****VIRTUAL MEETING*****

CALL IN BEGINS AT 7:15 p.m.

7:30 p.m.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Dan Neirinckx called the meeting to order at 7:35

2. **ROLL CALL:**

Present: Dan Neirinckx, Janet Mulder, Ed Mollon, Streeter Parker, Eve Nasby, Steve Wragg, Kevin May, Rachel Vedder, Michael Casinelli, Amber Recklau, Summer Piper, Preston Brown,

Absent:

Excused:

Guests: Cheryl Green, Judy Strang, Becky Rapp

3. **APPROVAL** of the Agenda for March 23, 2021 and Approval of the Final Minutes for the Meeting of March 9, 2021. Kevin May made the motion. It was approved unanimously.

4. **OPEN FORUM:**

a. **Kevin May** reported that on March 12, 2021, he attended a Zoom meeting of the San Diego County Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) where there was a presentation of the proposed update of the Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP) and asked if the SR-94/Otay Lakes Road intersection was included in the LRSP. He

was told that it was not. The reason it is not included is that projects like this, where a county road intersects a state road, the county defers to the state. So, if we have concerns about this intersection, we should contact Caltrans (which we have already done in our letter of 12-4-20). This is consistent with what he was told when he called and talked to another TAC engineer a week earlier, who also suggested he call Brian Hadley at Caltrans and gave him his phone numbers. Kevin has not contacted Brian Hadley or anybody else at Caltrans yet.

The LRSP has identified approximately 60 intersections and 60 road segments that they feel needed to be addressed and presented the top 10 in the meeting (none of which are in our area). They will include all of them in their full report. The LRSP's timeline towards making a recommendation to the BOS by 6-30-21 includes outreach to the public (including CPGs) starting in March, so we should be getting something from them soon.

- b. **Eve Nasby** asked the new members to go to the Jamul Dulzura Community Planning Group Facebook
- c. **Michael Casinelli** said that while he voted to approve the Tractor Supply, he is disappointed in the style they chose as it is ugly. **Eve Nasby** said that the community is not pleased with the design or the size which they have voiced on the JDCPG Facebook page. **Janet Mulder** asked about the distance between the road and the building a looks quite close to the traffic lanes and there was supposed to be an area for walking along the side of the road.
- d. **SummerPiper** asked Eve to help her find the Facebook Page as she has had a problem accessing the site. Eve will send her the url.
- e. **Preston Brown** gave an update on Village 13 and 14. California Attorney General Xavier Becerra today filed motions to intervene in lawsuits challenging the County of San Diego's approval and certification of Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) for the proposed Otay Ranch Resort Village 13 and Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16/19 Project (collectively, Otay Ranch) projects. The projects, located in a very high fire hazard severity zone, are part of a 23,000-acre residential development, the largest in San Diego County's history. In today's filings, Attorney General Becerra argues that the EIRs do not adequately analyze the impacts of increased wildfire risk created by bringing thousands of new people and significant development to an undeveloped area – and that the projects fail to mitigate or avoid such impacts in violation of the California Environmental Quality Act.

“Local governments must address the wildfire risks associated with new developments at the front end. It is imperative for public safety – and required by the law. Today's action aims to ensure that the County of San Diego does all it can to mitigate the risks of the Otay Ranch projects before they are built.”

Michael Casinelli asked did it include the cumulative impact as that is what our Planning Group questioned. **Preston Brown** read the following in answer.

- 1) Analyze the extent to which the Otay Ranch projects could increase wildfire risk;
- 2) Assess the cumulative wildfire impacts of the 23,000-acre Otay Ranch residential development; and

- 3) Analyze and address the Otay Ranch projects' individual and cumulative greenhouse gas impacts.

e. **Dan Neirineckx** told us the County was looking for input for roads that were a priority for need of improvement in our area.

5. **County General Plan changes: 1. Safety Element, 2. Environmental Justice Element** - **Preston Brown reported that** the subcommittee of **Summer Piper and Amber Recklau** met and he wanted to be able to make specific suggestions to the County as they are updating the Safety. One of the things he hopes will be addressed are the Evacuation Routes but there are gray areas as to what this should include, and he wants our Planning Group to be in on the discussion. He read a statement as follows:

“We strongly encourage and recommend that the “SAFETY ELEMENT” UPDATE FOR THE GP define clear objectives for “evacuation routes” that include older established rural communities like Jamul Dulzura.

Both SB-99 and AB-2911 encourage or implicitly direct the goal of at least 2 evacuation routes for communities. Areas like ours in the Unincorporated County are spread out and have backcountry roads that reach out into tributary like dead end culled sacs over some very rough terrain leaving only one way out.

In past discussions considering evacuation routes, additions or alterations, our community has expressed the desire to maintain privacy, flexibility on road standards on private property, and the ability to participate in the decision-making process. We hope that we can work through a process that will recognize and protect our unique and individual rural character.

Our community planning group wishes to coordinate with the unified fire authorities, the County BOS and PDS to find solutions to continually improve emergency evacuation preparedness and evacuation routes that are specifically tailored to the needs and challenges of our planning district of Jamul Dulzura. We also seek that the Safety Element Update provide a source for obtaining funding to implement any solutions that are mutually reached by all stakeholders.

Eve Nasby questioned the funding part of the statement. **Summer Piper** said that there are several different guidelines coming down from State which is asking Counties to look at their areas if they have adequate evacuation routes. **Preston Brown** pointed out that the funding source comes for several different areas and wonders if we should include this in our recommendation that the County include a commitment of funding and support in the GP Update. The people working on the safety element are questioning what the State means by “community”. **Summer Piper** said that the workshop only includes the County environmental plan and does not include evacuation routes. **Preston** felt that SB99 and AB2911 are an important part of the “Safety Element” Update, but needed guidance from the state and the County came to us for input especially as to evacuation routes. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that not only does the County need to follow through on the plan but when he listened to two webinars that they ended up talking about the results of climate change and evacuation routes. And in their Polls identified the effects of climate change and Wildland fires as the greatest threat to their communities. **Ed Mollon** asked if it included the need to upgrade to evacuation routes? **Summer Piper** stated that the State wants each

County to put together a list of areas that do not have two evacuation routes. There is also a question as to what is a “community”. Would Lawson Valley be considered a community? There is not much information regarding evacuation routes in this discussion, **Preston Brown** said we run into the problem of interpreting if we have a population to justify improvements to existing local highways. He pointed out that some of these “country cul de sacs” would have to be looked at but would need the community buy-in to accomplish this. **Preston Brown** suggested a “statement of intent” letting them know that our community is concerned and that we are trying to define clear objectives for evacuation routes. **Janet Mulder** suggested that the Chair send a letter telling them we want to be included and stating the challenges we face and our suggestions. **Summer Piper** said we want to be included but was not sure we should make recommendations until we know what the State is proposing. **Kevin May** asked if the sub-committee was addressing 5-1.6 high area risk location and asked if had ever been discussed. **Preston Brown** said the last workshop on the Safety Element is scheduled for March 30 at 6 p.m. **Amber Recklau** pointed on page 12 policy 7 in the mobility section to encourage the establishment of secondary emergency evacuation routes in the area. **Dan Neirinckx** gave the opportunity for members of the community to give input, but no one had any. After discussion with **Summer Piper and Preston Brown** giving input, and **Michael Casinelli’s** ideas the following motion was voted upon.

Preston Brown moved that we vote to send a letter from the chair regarding the Safety Element and strongly recommend that our community needs to have updates and input on the process and further that our community needs to be involved from the beginning especially regarding the safety and environmental plan which we feel also needs to include evacuation routes. Motion approved: Yes, 11; No, 0; 1 Abstention (Steve Wragg – conflict of interest.)

- 6. Proposed County Grading Ordinance changes** **Dan Neirinckx** said the PDS proposed three options. First, A minor ordinance update which involves clarifying the text and other minor items. Second: Zoning verification permit which defines the clearing of land is defined differently as clearing is pulling the tree up by the roots, giving a chance for runoff. The new zoning verification permit is consistent with the draft environmental report provides an opportunity for people to go above the five acres without permit. Staff is recommending the first proposal. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that if it is a lot not requiring agriculture, there are no requirements for replanting and causes problems for the neighbors and causes problems for neighbors and he feels that there needs to be a time limit on replanting. **Steve Wragg** told us that there is a requirement to replant. When you clear your land today, you need to plant it with agriculture or erosion control devices like fiber roll, planting, or something like that. **Michael Casinelli** said the County told him there was not a limit. A neighbor had turned in a plan but did not follow through and caused major problems to the neighborhood when the rains occurred. **Dan Neirinckx** will keep us advised as to what is decided and PDS was requesting which option they should use. **Janet Mulder** asked which option we would prefer and we should let PDS know before it goes to the Board of Supervisors. **Dan Neirinckx** said that he preferred Option 1 as Option 2 would require a preliminary report tied to the MSCP and how much they would have to mitigate and would cause high financial concerns. **Dan Neirinckx** will send a copy of the report to all and then we can all have the information. We can make comments once the Board has made their comments, but **Janet Mulder** asked if we should move to suggest Option 1 or Option 2 is the best alternative. Option 2 is tied to the MSCP and North County is looking at how much they would have to mitigate which makes Option 2 very involved. **Dan Neirinckx** suggested that we voice our opinion that Alternative 3 is unacceptable. **Preston Brown** asked Dan to send us the link and he will do it. Discussion followed regarding all

three of the options including whether or not it involves fire protection beyond the five acres, which allows a “self-certification” which means that person making the self-certification, is the one who will be sued, and not the County. **Steve Wragg** is concerned that would be a problem in Option 2.

Steve Wragg moved we support Option 1 which improves language and clarity without changing requirements, pulling out the agricultural requirements from the grading options for clarity but the other options are too open and the cost and timing could be excessive. Motion carried: Unanimously.

7. **Board of Supervisors Proposed County Cannabis Zoning Changes: Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that comments made at the last two meetings were sent to **Supervisor Joel Anderson** and he appreciated them and would like to have more of our thoughts on the subject. **Dan Neirinckx** reminded us that the Needle Exchange Program vote was held at the last JDCPG meeting and there were not enough votes to carry our idea. **Carol Green**, resident, would encourage us to ask Supervisor Joel Anderson and the BOS whether or not they wanted to allow this substance in our back county area. She has personal experience, as her 22-year-old son went off his program and went on a journey that was heartbreaking and was hospitalized 2 times and the worst of his problems occurred after he told her that “they wouldn’t tell us that it is safe, if marijuana was harmful” and she is afraid that the introduction of cannabis in Jamul would encourage others and in the memory of her son, would recommend not allowing cannabis in our area. The financial gain of the County would be far outweighed by the problems caused. **Michael Casinelli** asked if Dan felt that this would be discussed again in further Planning Group meetings and sent to Supervisor Joel Anderson. **Becky Rap, resident**, pointed out that the Supervisors are allowing more time to look at the pros and cons and she feels that Planning Group Members are being heard and that Supervisor Anderson wants to hear from us and our letters are vital. The County’s ordinance assumes that the persons buying the product, get in their cars and drive away and on our rural narrow winding roads that could be a real problem. The National Safety Council says that motor vehicle deaths are higher this year than any other year. These are particularly important realizing that 2020 was a year of less travel. Problems with the location of the places as they have been able to manipulate the distance between cannabis sales and other businesses getting too close to schools or other places where children are present. They will manipulate the figures, but we know the dangers. **Janet Mulder** stated that we need to make sure we keep in touch with **Supervisor Anderson’s** office (and any others in which we know people) to make sure they are aware of our concerns. In addition we need to encourage them to follow Proposition 64 and have a vote of the people in the individual communities. Our San Diego County Registrar of Voters already had this mechanism set up through the San Diego County Community Planning Group elections so should be able to have elections rather easily. **Dan Neirinckx** will send the minutes to **Supervisor Anderson’s** office assuring them we would be glad to give them further input.

8. JDCPG OFFICER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

a. **Dan** announced that they are looking for a priority list of the necessary road repairs in our area. **Michael Casinelli** asked if Dan wanted us to make a priority list and send to him by the next meeting. **Kevin May** asked if we could solicit information from the community? **Eve Nasby** will put it on the Facebook page and ask for comments from the community. **Michael Casinelli** reminded us that we need to ask them to not only name the road, but also to tell what they think would make it safer and better. **Dan Neirinckx** will put it on the agenda at the next meeting so the audience can make recommendations.

9. **Adjournment: Chair Dan Neirinckx adjourned the meeting at 9:22 p.m. thanking**

everyone for their comments.

Respectfully submitted:

Janet Mulder, Secretary

NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

7:30 P.M. TUESDAY April 13, 2021

SITE: Virtual Meeting format until public/in-person meetings permitted.

Meeting minutes and agendas can be accessed at

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/CommunityGroups.html>

NOTICE OF SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING.

GENERAL PLAN: SAFETY ELEMENT AND

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ELEMENT

6:30 P.M. TUESDAY March 23, 2021

VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT, SIGNIN/JOIN INFORMATION SAME AS REGULAR MEETING

CALLIN BEGINS AT 6:20 PM

PUBLIC NOTICE

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Public Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.

JAMUL/DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

MISSION STATEMENT:

The mission of the Jamul-Dulzura Community Planning Group is to represent the best interests of the communities of Jamul and Dulzura while adhering to County of San Diego, California Board of Supervisors Policy I-1.

PURPOSE STATEMENT:

The purpose of the Jamul-Dulzura Community Planning Group is:

To provide a public forum where local citizens can learn about issues of importance to them and their community and provide input.

To carefully consider all input when advising the county on such issues as planning, land use, discretionary projects, and community and sub-regional plans.

APPROVED 5/12/2020