

**JAMUL DULZURA  
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP  
FINAL MINUTES  
Tuesday, May 10, 2011  
Approved May 24, 2011  
Oak Grove Middle School Library  
7:30 pm**

1. **Call to Order:** Michael Casinelli called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m.
  
2. **Roll Call: Present:** Dan Kjonggaard, Janet Mulder, Steve Wragg, Jean Strouf, Dale Fuller, Michael Casinelli, Dan Neirinckx, Yvonne Purdy-Luxton, Preston Brown, William Herde, and Judy Bohlen  
  
**Absent:** Earl Katzer,  
  
**Excused:** Jonathan Shultz, Randy White  
**Vacant Seat:** #7 Frank Hewitt resigned
  
3. **Motion to approve the Agenda for May 10, 2011 as posted 72 hours before the meeting and the minutes of April 26, 2011 Motion carried unanimously.**
  
4. **Open Forum - Opportunity for public to speak on any item not on the agenda,**
  - a. **Steve Wragg was appointed to be on a “Red Tape Task Force” appointed by Supervisor Dianne Jacob. He is one of 7 appointed to look at the County of San Diego Permit Processing** trying to streamline it and be more efficient and cut costs. They will be reporting back to the BOS at the end of the year with recommendations. It is an open hearing, posted on the Website. So far they have met twice at the new Operations Center in Kearny Mesa and the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 18 at 2 p.m.
  - b. **Michael Cassinelli announced that currently there is one opening on the Planning Group. Nominations will be accepted until June 14 and the vote will be on June 28. All residents are all invited to attend the meetings and apply.**
  - c. **Michael Casinelli contacted Joe Zulauf and Don Parent regarding the SDG&E’s proposed substation as per the Group’s suggestion at the last meeting at which Earl Katzer said that there had been SDG&E people surveying a site in Proctor Valley. Don Parent, SDG&E Public Affairs Manager sent the following email to Michael:**

*“As mentioned in our last communication, our engineering staff and subject matter experts have been gathering detailed information on the alternate substation sites in order to help "rule out" any that will not meet the minimum qualifications for the substation facility. Last week we received the final draft of the grounding study on one of the sites and that information is currently under internal review. The feasibility study for the transmission route is also nearing completion and a first draft is expected in mid May.*

*After both grounding and transmission feasibility studies are completed, they will undergo further internal review followed by a recommendation to senior management by our substation project team for a preferred site based on the latest findings and previous input from the community.*

*We're estimating that this process will take a couple of months and that we'll be requesting a place on your CPG agenda around the end of June or early July in order to share our findings with you and the community at that time. You can be assured that the CPG will be informed well in advance of any decisions being made on this project.*

*As far as land surveying on Proctor Valley Rd... SDG&E has not had surveyors in the field working on this project for some time (several months). We're not sure what the resident saw there but it could have been someone from our project team walking near one of the alternate sites or perhaps one of our engineering consultants gathering information. However consultants have only been out there twice in the past couple of months and would have been accompanied by an SDG&E employee. I would be happy to look into this further once I have dates and times. You could have the resident call me to discuss (number below) or I'll make the call if you provide his/her contact information.*

**Michael Casinelli** will contact **Earl Katzer** to find out the name of the resident and pass that info onto **Don Parent**.

**d. Judy Bohlen and Jean Strouf will not be at the next meeting.**

**5. Community Evacuation Route Study for Jamul/Dulzura – Dan Kjonggaard gave a brief summary of the work done by this committee which included Judy Bohlen, Stacy Magoffin and representatives from Rural Fire.** Our area and Valley Center were chosen to do a pilot study on community evacuation routes. We started with 18 possible and ended up with 10 possible routes. He introduced **Bob Citrano, SDCounty**, who introduced the consultants who were also present at the first meeting before our JDCPG including, **Stephen Cook and Mark Peterson of Fehr & Peers and Domenic Lupo of AECOM**. This will be a first step in a process to determine the feasibility and **Bob Citrano** assured us that this is a study and will not be implemented until funding would be present and the final corridors have been determined and okayed. The needs assessment looked at 18 possible evacuation corridors that would allow people to evacuate our area. They did an initial screening and a detailed screening using an evaluative process with the committee to determine the feasibility. This led them from 18 to 10 possible corridors. Most were eliminated due to topographical or land ownership issues. The ten were looked at again looking at the engineering/cost assessments the evacuation effectiveness and the priorities of the community. The availability of roads (public vs private), suitability of roads (maintained and free of obstructions i.e., gates, road width, etc) **The PowerPoint and maps they presented were to be attached at the end of these minutes and made a part of them, however the PowerPoint was not received and therefore only the original map is attached. Bob Citrano will be sending the PowerPoint when he receives it from Fehr and Peers to the Planning Group email list.**

**Steve Wragg** asked about the right of ways going through private land – what are the design standards, surfacing, gated, non-gated, public, private, etc. **Domenic Lupo** stated that they were looking at public standards for the roads – rural collector and rural residential

both of which have 2 12-foot lanes with 48 foot ROW without gates or obstructions. **Steve asked** how these right of way purchases would be funded? **Dominic Lupo** stated that it would be a combination of ways, but **Mark Peterson** did not see the private owner paying for it. **Dominic Lupo** stated it could be paid for via a community assessment district or a grant. **Steve Wragg** asked why it was not going through the General Plan. **Bob Citrano** stated that local public roads are not covered by the General Plan but in 2006 they designated alternative roads as “fire access roads” but it was not contained within the General Plan. A local public road network was also not looked at in the General Plan. A community could do a local public road network. **Mark Peterson** suggested that an expanded network of local public roads could be established to ensure availability and suitability for evacuation purposes and Use of County Public Road Standards with options for design modifications. There could be Community Access Easements, which could include private roads meeting acceptable design standards and requires HOA, Maintenance District or equivalent. **Steve Wragg** asked what the timing is for this type of project? **Bob Citrano** said that they plan to go to the BOS this fall, but there is no money allocated. He feels that it will be up to the interest of the community. He does not see it happening until funding is available which could be more than 5-10 years.

**Liz Alexander, resident** asked about the private road – could they sub-divide if on a private road. Is there a difference in the category between private and public roads? **Pat Anderson, resident**, asked would the people who live on the road be notified if there is to be a change in status. **Bob Citrano** assured them that before anything is done, they would all be notified. **Mark Peterson** pointed out that this is all conceptual and nothing is being proposed for action. They just want to know if the public and Planning Group think these are feasible locations and that they want to pursue establishing evacuation routes. **Dean Alexander** asked if they had considered a prioritizing process of the choice of roads, when and if the plan becomes a reality. **Dan Kjonggaard** pointed out that this study started due to the fire of 2007 because the people did not have evacuation routes and it was determined that routes would be important. He pointed out that if enough people do not want the route, then it would not be built. **Preston Brown** asked, as a new JDCPG member, if they were going to listen to the public as to better locations than are shown on their conceptual maps. **Mark Peterson** said yes, they wanted community input. **Virginia Titus** asked to see the corridor 2 map in order to give input as the residents have done much study on the possible evacuation routes.

They went over the maps – asking for input as to possible feasibility or problems -

**Corridor 1** – Campo Rd to Proctor Valley Road – using Millar Ranch Road – to dirt paths

**Corridor 2** – Alta Loma Lane from Jamul Drive circling up to come down via Trina’s Way which connects to Fowler Canyon – **Pat Anderson**, resident, pointed out that Alta Loma Lane is a dirt path.

**Teresa McKenna** suggested that the County needs to lessen the road standard to SRA 14 to say that two 8 foot roads are better. In order to make this a reality, the standards need to be lessened. **Domenic Lupo** stated that DPW is not willing to accept anything less than the 28’ road due to liability.

**Pam Fleming** asked if these corridors will need to follow the whole thing or can they be partially accepted. **Mark Peterson** stated they are just conceptual at this point.

**Corridor 5** – Lyons Valley Road through Olive Vista through Jamul Highlands to dirt to Rancho Jamul Estates through Presilla Drive to SR 94. **Steve Wragg** pointed out that the Presilla is gated and an affluent community and would not want to remove the gate.

**Teresa McKenna** asked if it wasn't better to have a "road on the ground" even if it did not meet the road standards? She pointed out that the liability issue belongs in the lap of the County as they allowed the houses to be built without secondary access. **Domenic Lupo** said that it was a liability issue and would not be allowed without correct road standards by the County. **Stephen Cook** said that there is a difference between County roads and private roads.

**Corridor 10 – Rudnick Road to Skyline Truck Trail - Ron White, Lawson Valley Ranch**, said that he feels this one can be done. His company owns 2/3rds of the land, and the existing road is to County Standards for dirt roads. He feels that it could happen with little or no problems.

**Corridor 11 – Honey Springs Road – Mother Grundy – Lucky 6 Truck Trail to SR 94 - Dana Mottola** pointed out that the road has a large washout and needs to be fixed before the next disaster. **Domenic Lupo** pointed out that a private road is not County maintained by definition. **Dana Mottola** stated that the road is gated in several places.

**Stephen Cook** pointed out that the existing gates or BLM owned land are not deciding factors in the decision

**Corridor 16 – Barrett Lake Road to Lyons Valley Road – Yvonne Purdy-Luxton** stated that this road is being federally maintained and utilized by the Border Patrol.

**Mark Peterson** presented the evacuation corridors preliminary cost estimates for construction only. It does not include purchase of right of way. He then presented the **effectiveness and benefit** scoring them 1-5. The chart shows number of population served, connectivity, secondary access, and came up with a final score to determine priorities to include all of the above. Highest priorities were corridors 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, and 12. Schools were not considered a separate value in determining evacuation routes but **Bob Citrano** stated they could be considered.

**Mark Peterson** stated the next steps are to finalize the evacuation corridor evaluation; meet with stakeholder committee review, document findings and recommendations in draft/final study reports. **Steve Wragg** asked how they could let the community know the routes and get their input. **Bob Citrano** stated that this is the beginning stages of the planning and the steps in the process have just begun. **Dan Kjonggaard** stated that he feels the JDCPG can make the recommendation to go with the corridors that have been identified. It was suggested that the information including the map should be run in the **Jamul Shopper** which will get the information to the majority of the Jamul-Dulzura residents and then a sub-committee would take the community input and give it to the Planning Group who would then make recommendations to the Corridor Study.

**Dan Neirinckx** moved that we discuss this at the June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting which would be attended by **Bob Citrano** of DPLU, after putting a carefully worded notice in the June Jamul Shopper alerting the community to this discussion, providing a website for them to access the evacuation corridor study and include the copy of the map of the 10 corridors and take a vote on our position at that time.

**Judy Bohlen** left the meeting at this point....**Dan Neirinckx** moved we extend the meeting until 10:15. Motion carried.

6. TPM21068 –Sajady – 3551 Jamul Vista Drive ( Babel) Drive (off Skyline near Skyline)  
**Dan Neirinckx** moved that JDCPG recommend that mitigation lands purchased for OFF-SITE MITIGATION per paragraph 2. B. 2. on page 3, be purchased within the Jamul Dulzura planning as a first priority and that a letter be sent to

**DPLU stating same. Motion carried.**

**7. TPM 21004- RPL1 Vidovich – Heide Lane – Dan Neirinckx** said this came before our Group in 12/2007 and we wanted to review the new information before making a decision. The consultant **Joel Waymire, Polaris Development Consultants**, representing the owner, reported that there were few changes. They made the lots all within the 1-acre minimum without slope requirements. They are being asked to bring the road up to county standards, which they will do. There were no environmental reports submitted in the first application and there were some submitted with this one. **Dan Neirinckx** stated they meet county standards. **Steve and Marlene Mishler**, 3243 Heide Lane, residents for several years, stated that they are concerned about the site distance between parcels 1, 2 and 4 and their property. They would wish to add a wall between the sub-division and their property with the sub-divider paying for the wall. They are working with the developer to accomplish an agreement. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that the 40-foot easement, paving 24-foot can look at moving the center line, shoving the travel lane as far as possible towards the development and away from the Mishler property. **Dan Neirinckx** stated that a structure could not be built within the easement but plantings could mitigate the view-shed between the two properties that would occur with a wall. **Dan** questioned that the change in the view-shed as being negative as it has been disturbed prior to this subdivision so that its environmental impacts are considered insignificant. **Jenna Pipike** lives adjacent to proposed parcels one and two. She is asking the developer to mitigate the view-shed of their driveway so it will not be a significant impact on her view as her house is below the proposed driveway. **Mr. Vidovich** pointed out that he has no control over what the new owners will plant or not plant on the property after it has been sold. **Steve Wragg** pointed out that the **Mishlers** could go through the County Planner, and that in all probability the General Plan Update will probably not be approved for 4-5 years. **Dan Neirinckx** moved that we recommend approval of the plans submitted with the exception that the center line of the travel-way from Heide Lane to subdivision parcels along the Mishler's northern property line be moved as far north as possible. Motion carried unanimously.

**8. Jamul Indian Village Casino Update – No Report.**

**9. JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS**

- a. **MUP11-016 – ATT Cell Tower – SR 94 and Barrett Smith Road – Dan Kjonegaard will review and report back.**
- b. **Jean Strouf cannot make May 20 Equestrian Ordinance Options meeting – DPLU Suite B – 9 a.m. – Yvonne Purdy-Luxton will attend for her.**
- c. **AD10-024 – Martha Barba – 1781 Mother Grundy TT Jamul – Horse Barn – given to Yvonne Purdy-Luxton to review and report back.**

**Adjournment:** Michael Casinelli adjourned the meeting 10:42 PM, reminding us that the next regular meeting is **May 24, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. at OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL LIBRARY.**

Respectfully submitted, Janet Mulder, Secretary

Meeting minutes and agendas can be accessed at <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/CommunityGroups.html>.