

**JAMUL DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
FINAL MINUTES**

March 27, 2018

APPROVED AS REVISED APRIL 10, 2018

Oak Grove Middle School Library

7:30 p.m.

1. **Michael Casinelli, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.**
2. **ROLL CALL:** Dan Neirinckx, Michael Casinelli, Janet Mulder, Randy White, Eileen Poole, Jean Strouf, Judy Bohlen, Joe Stuyvesant, Hannah Gbeh, Steve Wragg, Preston Brown and Bill Herde.

Excused: Richard Marzec,
Absent:
Seats 5 & 11 Vacant
3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA for March 27, 2018 and the Final Minutes of the JDCPG MARCH 13, 2018, meeting corrected as mailed: Approved unanimously.**
4. **OPEN FORUM**
 - a. **Jean Strouf – attended the Dehesa Community Group and the Sycuan Sloan Canyon Trail meeting** that was called to get input from the community on the plan Parks and Rec came up with as a trails solution. They want input on each of the sections and are in the process of collecting information on the best alternative staging area. Presenters were **Meg Diss**, County Parks & Rec and **Marianne Vancio** representing the Dehesa Community. The area used to be a sand mine and was sold to **Sycuan** who agreed to put trail through which would be paid for by the County. They presented a preliminary engineering study to show location of Right of Way, impacts with species, obstacles. **Segment 1**, trail off Dehesa Rd onto Sycuan property. Jumps onto Haul Rd. Western part meanders through trees. Need to get ROW. **Segment 2** is along Sloan Canyon. Enough room to get trail on one side. ROW is 60 feet. 2 Bridges to cross. **Segment 3:** goes into USFG to connect Sloan Canyon to Refuge. Dead ends at McGinty Mountain. **Segment 4:** connects Sycuan property on SW corner onto KDLC. Needs BIA easement. ends on Model A Lane. **Segment 5:** goes from Sloan Canyon to Beaver Hollow and the CA Hiking & Riding Trail. County ROW ends 25 feet down, so needs a lot of EIR, grants, permits. **Segment 6** is along Dehesa to Willow Glen. North side is steep & dangerous. South side trail needs to be in use by 2030 and started soon to meet agreements.
 - b. **Eileen Poole** reminded the community that there will be a large bicycle event that will go through Jamul on **April 8**. Grand Fondo means that there will be lots of bicycles, so be careful with your driving.

c. **Michael Casinelli** announced that the new Board members' names will go before the Board of Supervisors for approval and he ordered name plaques for **Mark Manis, and Darren Greenhaigh**. Michael expects them to be approved before our next meeting.

d. **Michael Casinelli** took our concerns to the County regarding the grading on **Simpson's Nursery old property** and he received notice from Supervisor Jacob's office that pointed out that the owner had originally applied for minor grading permit to grade 4800 yards. But now they are applying for a major grading permit to allow him to grade 30,000 cubic yds. The property has not been split and therefore it is one parcel and already has at least one dwelling unit and several other structures. Our question is why is there a need for so much grading and how can they build another house without a lot split? The area is zoned A-70. **Michael will continue to monitor.**

e. **Parks and Rec wants to come to our meeting** to talk about proposed changes to PLDO and **Michael Casinelli** invited Marcus Lubich to the April 10, 2018 meeting to discuss the changes and will address any questions we have on Village 14's proposed park. He would like for us to turn in the questions early so he can be prepared.

f. **Tractor Supply Service people want** to come to April 10, 2018 meeting to present their idea for a business to be located behind the Arco AM/PM in downtown Jamul.

g. **Otay Water will** be coming April 24, 2018 meeting to discuss the progress of the new sewer line construction.

h. **Merek Winiarz – resident** asked about a huge pile of trash near Wild Mustang Trail and pointed it could be a fire hazard. **Michael Cassinelli** suggested he contact code enforcement.

i. **Michael Casinelli** reported that the JDCPG will be voting on the County's recommendation for the removal of trees located at 3245 Rancho Miguel Road at the April 10 meeting.

5. **Village 14, Planning Areas 16 & 19 Draft EIR – Greg Mattson, SD County Project Manager - Dan Neirinckx, Subcommittee chair. Greg Mattson** made a brief presentation with display boards, followed by Q&A. He is looking for public feedback. He introduced **Mark Slovick, of the County**, who wanted to make sure the members of the audience had the latest rendition. **All comments are due on DEIR by April 16, 2018. All responses will be a part of the final documents when it goes to the Board of Supervisors. Community comments need to be in writing, emailed to Greg Mattson or turn in the comment sheet available this evening (and attached to these minutes.) Put your name on the comment sheet and you will be invited to attend a meeting to discuss the information. Greg Mattson** went over the map and showed the location of Village 14 and Planning Areas 16 (112 ranchette lots) and 19 (13 estate lots). He pointed out that **Proctor Valley Road** leads to the development. Inside the Village 14 there is a school site proposed through Chula Vista School District. If it is not used for the school it could have 97 residential units. There is a Multi-use trail of 4 1/2 miles that runs from Chula Vista to Jamul. They are talking with the trails people as to where they should locate staging areas and connecting trails. There are significant unavoidable impacts

including visual, agriculture, air quality, traffic, but the rest are mitigable, according to **Greg Mattson**. Otay Water District will provide the water. County will provide the sewer. All of the proposed areas were studied in **the sewer basin study of 1994** (Salt Creek Interceptor Study). Otay Ranch would be sewerred and no connections would occur outside of Otay Ranch. A road connection is proposed down Whispering Meadows Lane into Planning Area 16. CEQA requires that alternatives be considered in the EIR.

Alternatives presented in the EIR include no project, land exchange alternative, a reduced density alternative, an alternate site, and a 4-lane Proctor Valley Road alternative connecting to SR 94. As proposed in the project, Proctor Valley Road will be two lanes (one lane in each direction) from Chula Vista to Jamul with 5 roundabouts to slow down traffic and a wider median through the village core. Some of the alternative sites give smaller density. The original Otay Ranch approvals had a realignment of Proctor Valley Road out to SR 94; but that is proposed not to occur but is analyzed in the EIR.

Randy White questioned regarding Whispering Meadows connection and pointed out that it is a private road but **Greg Mattson** said that the County has an IOD on them so could be used as a connection. Traffic would be light as it would provide access primarily for the 30 homes in the eastern part of Panning Area 16 and is shown in the Traffic Report in the EIR. **Randy White** asked about the traffic from the casino, which would be using the paved Proctor Valley Road whereas the dirt road is not used as much. **Mark Slovick** pointed out that the traffic study takes the casino traffic into consideration.

Judy Bohlen asked how many trips per day come from each home. **Steve Wragg** said the rule of thumb is 10-12 ADTS per house. **Judy Bohlen** pointed out that ten ADTs will be a huge number and cause a real traffic problem to residents just like the traffic to and from Steele Canyon High School has caused terrific problems. She pointed out that the developer goes away after the construction is completed and the residents are left with the huge traffic problem as an aftermath!

Preston Brown – Originally when sewer is planned it sets a certain amount that would be allowed to be on sewer but his question was, is there a maximum list for the sewer capacity on this project? **Greg Mattson** said that the numbers from the proposed development within Otay Ranch were all considered except **Planning Area 17 out by Dulzura which is denied sewer and must use septic**. **Preston Brown** referred to a letter from Fish and Wildlife written 2016, and asked them to address it. **Mark Slovick** pointed out that the County does not have a recommendation at this point, and that they just want to make sure all of the environmental impacts are addressed.

Eileen Poole pointed out that 1119 homes will make a huge amount of traffic and impact all of us in this community. Adding these huge numbers of cars without any SR 94 improvements could spell disaster for our community.

Jean Stouf had researched the Project alternatives that they are required to do in the plan and addressed them as follows: **1.** The No Build Alternative which supposedly needs to be discarded because it will not meet the County's requirement for more housing. **2.** The Low-Density Alternative appears fairly attractive, in that it meets some additional housing, and yet retains much of the quality & character of the area. **3.** The Alternate Site Location Alternative was proposed by several conservation groups. Jean suggests we look at who helped come up with this alternative. It allows for more housing than Alternative 2, and most of the development is South of the Jamul boundary. Again, impact to our community would be significantly less than the proposed project. A major argument against this Alternative is that it is inconsistent with the County General Plan. Jean would argue that bringing sewer into Jamul is inconsistent with our General Plan. **4.** The 4-Lane Proctor Valley Road Alternative is the same as Proposed Project with the

exception of widening Proctor Valley (less 12 units). This is equivalent to #1 or #3 above. **5.** State Fish & Wildlife originally considered Alternative 5, the Land Exchange Alternative, but then took it off the table. I believe some of this was due to opening of the casino, and a re-evaluation of Wildlife Safety Corridors. Alternative 5 would add about 40% more homes to Village 14 in exchange for not developing Planning Areas 16 & 19. This Alternative is presented in detail in the EIR because it was originally to be the main option before State F & W withdrew support. The State is adamant about not relinquishing their property for the Otay Ranch development. Until we get a detailed rationale for F & W pulling out of the Land Swap Alternative, Jean suggests we not consider it as an alternative. **6.** Several other not-so-feasible alternatives are listed for comparison sake. Jean told us she firmly believes that alternatives to the Proposed Project or Land Exchange Alternative 5 are very practical and need to be closely evaluated. As the proposals stand in this EIR, Jean suggests would vote for Alternative 1: No Build. Alternative 2, the Low Density option is fairly attractive, and Alternative 3 is somewhat acceptable. The Jamul-Dulzura Community Plan calls for NO Sewer. Jean believes the alternatives we've been given are either force the State Fish & Wildlife into a Land Swap OR allow Villages 16 & 19 to be built with Sewer. **Jean** concluded with, **“My position is Otay Ranch Village 14 developers need to go back to the drawing board & give us an alternative that does NOT require the State F & W land swap and does NOT allow Planning Areas 16 & 19 to have Sewer.”**

Dan Neirinckx pointed out the sub-committee meeting brought up that the plan seems to be set in stone as to the open space locations and he feels that it should be able to be exchanged and be more flexible between what exists and what is proposed. **Mark Slovic** pointed out that they are in the MSCP and were designated as open space or development and to make a change would require a boundary adjustment. **Greg Mattson** showed the lime green open space, within the Otay Ranch Preserve or within the HOA.

Janet Mulder questioned children in our Planning Area and within Jamul Dulzura School District boundaries being given to Chula Vista School District as that is not the way it is usually done, and Jamul Dulzura could certainly house and teach the students with their award winning programs. Sewer is a major concern as we do not want it in Jamul and this project would bring it here. She questioned the Feasibility Study that determined that none of the area would perc, when all of Jamul Dulzura is on septic and has referred the study to an engineer with more knowledge and experience than she has. Right from the beginning, when we were at possibly the ERB during the discussion re septic, JDCPG said that the Villages or Planning Areas in Jamul should be on septic and we were assured it would happen as the lot sizes would get larger as they came towards Jamul. The third area of concern is traffic because the paving of Proctor Valley Road and the widening of same will cause more people from South Bay to use it as a route to the Casino, thus increasing traffic through “downtown Jamul”. In addition, the use of Whispering Meadows would totally change that quiet neighborhood when you add the traffic from Village or Planning Area 16, and residents of Village 14 would soon learn that SR 94 would be a better route than Proctor Valley Road and cause an even bigger problem for our residents than we are now facing...which is SR-94 a traffic nightmare! **Bill Herde** – Traffic is a problem and as residents will continue through Jamul and will not all go south. His concern about the alternatives is that we keep hearing that parts have been approved but it is important to remember that **nothing** has actually been approved at this point...that is why we are here giving our input!

Steve Wragg: Aesthetics were not mitigated and why weren't they... **Greg Mattson** said it was the basic difference between wide open spaces to development which means that the aesthetic look of open space can't be mitigated. **Steve Wragg** asked about traffic and it was pointed out that the improvements stop at the place on the Proctor Valley Road, where the dirt road makes a sharp turn, **and this is a problem!** Why was Alternative 5 not accepted? **Rob Cameron** stated that the State declined to trade and so it couldn't occur. **Steve Wragg** likes the fact that the density decreases as you come up towards Jamul and understands the problems with the sewer and appreciates the fact that they are not making Proctor Valley Road 4 lanes as it would cause more problems, but doesn't understand why they think that people will go south and go through the toll road because he doesn't think they will! **Rob Cameron** said that there are 1,284 acres and they are required to preserve 780 acres ...a great portion of this is onsite. **Steve Wragg** asked about the sizes of the lots **Greg Mattson** said that there is a variety of lot 4500 sq ft to 8500 sq ft and goes to two acre minimum in the ranchete. **Steve** asked what is the school issue. **Greg** said they have four districts involved including Chula Vista, Jamul, Grossmont and Sweetwater are all involved in the discussion but it is not a CEQA issue. **Hannah Gbeh** asked how will sewer be prohibited in Jamul? **Greg Mattson** said that the Salt Creek Transportation agreement signed in 2016 would not allow it. **Hannah** asked about the bike lanes and **Greg** pointed out that yes there will be bike lanes. **Hannah Gbeh** agreed with **Steve** regarding the importance of having affordable housing but feels that the EIR is deficient in its analysis of growth inducement, which currently states less than significant impacts. The project is introducing new water, sewer, electricity and gas infrastructure to an undeveloped area and is removing barriers to infrastructure development that currently exist within rural Jamul. Additionally, the paving of Proctor Valley is effectively creating a major gateway from the City of San Diego and City of Chula Vista into our rural community, for which 2 entryways only currently exist. Therefore, the project is inducing growth. Impacts are significant and mitigation should be required to reduce these impacts to a level below significance. Mitigation to reduce growth-inducing impacts should include substantially more off-site traffic improvements, for which the currently proposed mitigation is deficient. Specifically, the project should provide additional off-site traffic improvements along the residential areas to the north - between where the currently proposed Proctor Valley Road improvements end and SR-94 begins, in addition to traffic calming features along SR94.

... **Joe Stuyvesant** said traffic is number one issue that it needs to be raised in the EIR and mitigation should be done. He asked where was the defining line of Otay Ranch where they plan to have sewer. **Greg Mattson** showed him the line and pointed out that it comes too far to exclude Planning Area 16. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that the General Plan will be adjusted to the developer's plan rather than the developer following General Plan. He pointed out that the fire danger has increased dramatically since this was originally proposed, and he fears the fire departments are not taking into consideration the changes that were recommended as a result of the Witch Creek and Harris Fires as well as the recent Santa Rosa fires. He feels that the EIR does not address the differences between what exists and what should be. The developer compares this development to several others in the area, but fails to see the differences between them. The lots as proposed appear very long and narrow. The County standard is a max 3:1 depth to width. It appears that you are getting a very urban streetscape in a rural area. Could the group ask for a "D" designator, which requires that the plan designate the design of the houses in the planned development thus ensuring that the Group would know what the development would actually look like?

Michael Casinelli opened the floor to the public for comment.

Marcia Spurgeon, resident, asked how it would be approved, all at once or piece by piece? **Greg Mattson** said the whole project which is Planning Area 16 and 19 and Village 14 would be approved together. **Marcia** pointed out that in the 1994 decision said that the sewer would not come to Jamul. What happened? She points out that the Proctor Valley Road comes into Jamul and they have not addressed the problems that the increased traffic will cause. The 9-acre school site problem is that there would not be enough room for classrooms, ball fields, parking lots, etc. The Chula Vista School District has k-6 elementary schools and then students attend Sweetwater School District for 7-8 and another school for 9-12 whereas Jamul Dulzura goes K-8 and then Grossmont Union High School District takes them 9-12 which is a much easier transition for students. **Greg Hoff, resident**, pointed out that there is only one fire station for the whole development and asked who thought that was enough? The roundabouts may look good but cause problems with emergency vehicles. **Greg Mattson** pointed out that the fire protection and emergency people have looked at the plan and approved it. **Greg Hoff** asked about the storefront for the Sheriff and was told they have looked at it and that's what they requested. **Nadine Bennett, Superintendent, Jamul Dulzura School District** said that designating the Chula Vista School District for the Jamul students would give the taxes, students, etc to Chula Vista, and Jamul Dulzura School District has the capacity to serve these students. The fiscal revenue loss would be \$1million dollars annually, and that does not include the developer fees. She pointed out that Jamul Dulzura School District has totally adequate capacity to handle these students as they are experiencing declining enrollment so they are asking that the district be given their students. **Rob Cameron** pointed out that the Otay Ranch approvals anticipated that students in Planning Areas 16 and 19 would attend the Jamul and Grossmont schools while students in Village 14 would attend Chula Vista and Sweetwater schools. The approvals also anticipated school district boundary adjustments to implement that plan. He indicated that much of Village 14 is already located in the Chula Vista/Sweetwater district, but a small portion located in the northern part of Village 14 is currently within the Jamul/Grossmont district. In the interest of keeping all of Village 14 together in the Chula Vista/Sweetwater schools as anticipated by the approvals, and in anticipation of accommodating neighbors whose students attend the new Chula Vista School wanting to go to the same school as their neighbors, the project proposes to adjust the district boundary line through the Transfer of Uninhabited Territory process. **Nadine Bennett** pointed out that Chula Vista has 42 schools and they are all K-6, whereas Jamul has 3 schools that nurture K-8 students who then matriculate to Grossmont High School District. When asked who will determine the boundaries for the students' schools, and **Nadine Bennett** said that the process for a boundary change would go to the County Board of Education, County Superintendent, and then to the State Board of Education as a boundary adjustment has severe impacts to school districts. **Dana Blasi** asked about the map wanting to be oriented to the streets and was concerned that the number of residents in Jamul would be doubled which would mean that this development would make a 50% increase in people and far greater percentage in traffic.

Joe Buckner asked about the ecological preserve and how building in Planned Area 16 would impact the groundwater that supply his wells. He points out that it is a designated farmland above it and is concerned that his water quality could be impacted.

Christopher Walker asked about the retention basin and asked about low income housing – was it being proposed as a part of the need for this development.

Katy Walker pointed out that the Chula Vista School District is overflowing, way overcrowded and Rolling Hills Schools are significantly impacted at this point. Sweetwater has no plans for additional high school. **Forest Olsen** stated that we should not give up our students or increase our traffic to allow more homes to be built in our area. **Connie Via** pointed out that she had an accident on SR94/Vista Sage and traffic will continue to be a problem and made much worse with this development without some mitigation. Please do mitigate these traffic problem areas that will only get worse. **Preston Brown** asked about the Salt Creek Master Plan and who did it and how and when was approved? **Greg Matson** stated that it was done through Chula Vista, and **Janet Mulder** pointed out that it never came before our Planning Group even though it had a huge impact on our Planning Area and we would never have agreed to the sewer there! **Dale Amato** asked about the Jamul Area Planning Area 16 and whether they would be on septic? **Mark Slovick** told him, yes they would be on sewer as the area did not perc. **Dan Neirinckx** has been challenging the perc test data and we are still questioning it and have asked the County for details and assurance that the research and interpretation are accurate. They have only produced a letter, without the backup documentation, which we expect to see before we make our recommendation. **Bill Fair** asked where the sewer ends on Proctor Valley Road and **Greg** said to the south of where the pavement now ends. **Joe Buckner** asked how do we stop this from happening? Could we use petitions? **Michael Casinelli** suggests the public submit comments and appear at the meetings. **Hannah Gbeh** pointed out that public input will be important! **Dan Neirinckx** reminded all that they can appear at both the Planning Commission Hearings and again when it comes before the Board of Supervisors and he would urge all to be there. **Farshid Dini** asked if Proctor Valley Road would be paved and rerouted. **Greg Mattson** said that the County would route the road away from the vernal pools and after that would follow the path of the existing road. **Sean Howard** looks at Planning Area 19 which is right next to his house and questions where the construction traffic would come from and **Greg Matson** said that it would probably come from the south. **Forest Olsen**- asked about utilities coming in like natural gas from the south. The answer is yes from **Mrs. Jackson** that they would be bringing in natural gas lines. **Randy White** asked how they will phase the sewer and the road and **Rob Cameron** said they don't know at this point in the process. **Steve Powell** – asked about the equestrian use – will it be allowed? The answer is yes -. **Rob Cameron** reported that staging areas are planned within the village core that would allow horse trailers. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that there is only one staging area that will allow horse trailers that he could see on the plan.

MICHAEL CASINELLI POINTED OUT THAT EVERYONE NEEDS TO FILL OUT AND SUBMIT (BEFORE 4 P.M. APRIL 16) THE PUBLIC REVIEW MEETING COMMENT SHEET WHICH IS ATTACHED TO THESE MINUTES. These important comment sheets can be mailed, emailed, or hand delivered to Gregory.mattson@sdcounty.ca.gov. Thanks to all who get them in!!!!

6. **JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE UPDATE – Town Hall Meeting will be held on April 11 at 7 p.m. in the Jamul Primary School to provide an update on what is happening.**
7. **JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS**

Important for all to be present at the next meeting as we will need to vote on the letter to be sent regarding the Otay Ranch Village 14 EIR.

- 8. ADJOURNMENT: Michael Casinelli, Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:43 p.m**

**Respectfully submitted,
Janet Mulder, Secretary**

NOTICE OF VILLAGE 14 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING:

6:00 P.M. – 7:15 P.M. TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 2018

OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL LIBRARY

NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

7:30 P.M. TUESDAY, April 10, 2018

OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL LIBRARY

Meeting minutes and agendas can be accessed at

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

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.