

**JAMUL DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP  
FINAL MINUTES**

**APRIL 24, 2018**

**APPROVED MAY 8, 2018**

**Oak Grove Middle School Library**

**7:30 p.m.**

1. **Michael Casinelli, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.**

2. **ROLL CALL:** Dan Neirinckx, Michael Casinelli, Janet Mulder, Eileen Poole, Jean Strouf, Joe Stuyvesant, Hannah Gbeh, Preston Brown, Darren Greenhalgh, and Bill Herde.

**Excused:** Steve Wragg, Judy Bohlen, Randy White, Richard Marzec, and Mark Manis.

**Absent:**

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA for APRIL 24, 2018 and the Final Minutes of the JDCPG April 10, 2018, meeting as corrected and emailed to all. Approved unanimously.**

4. **OPEN FORUM**

a. **Michael Casinelli welcomed new member Darren Greenhalgh and Mark Manis (who was not present as he was called out of town on business.) Both members have to complete the training before they can vote on the group, but the Board of Supervisors has approved their appointments.**

b. **Hannah Gbeh** pointed out that when she drives to the Dulzura Post Office to post the agenda for our meetings, the road (SR 94) is awful and very dangerous. She would like to invite Caltrans to a meeting and ask for help. SR-94 is a real problem as it has really bad curves. **Darren Greenhaigh** pointed out that there had been an increase in the tolls on the toll road Highway 125 and many of the trucks are avoiding it and using SR-94 instead which has caused much more truck traffic problems. In addition, with the increased truck traffic, the check point traffic becomes backed up and causes a problem... **Michael Casinelli** asked **Janet Mulder** to invite **Chi Vargas of Caltrans** to come to a JDCPG meeting to discuss the problems on SR-94.

c. **Preston Brown** has copies of the **Cal Fish and Wildlife Response for the DEIR of Village 14 and Planning Area 16 and 19**. Contact him if you would like to review a copy.

d. **Janet Mulder** spoke with **Chi Vargas** of Caltrans regarding the SR-94 projects that were part of the Caltrans FEIR on the Jamul Indian Village Casino. She told him that the representatives from Village 14 and Planning Area 16 and 17 said that they were responsible for the light at Lyons Valley Road and SR94, and yet that was one of the mitigations for the JIV project. **Chi Vargas** explained that each new or proposed

development in an area is responsible for a portion of the improvements and that Simpson Farms Development was also part of the Lyons Valley Road and SR94 signalization plan along with the other two. He explained the status of the six areas: 1) Lyons Valley Rd/SR-94 – permit approved in Jan- need 120 days to get the poles for the signal lights. Start in month or so..2) Jamacha Blvd – widening near Skyline Church – County staff taking to BOS this week. 3) Jamacha Rd at SR-94 turn lanes – drawing are completed; BOS approved 4/25 transfer of land to Caltrans Environmental mitigation. 4) Maxfield Rd was put in with Lyons Valley Road improvements. Person who purchased Simpson Farms apparently not talking to JIV now – needs IOD. 5) Melody Road – JIV still meeting with owners as they don't want to sell – waiting for agreement. 6) Steele Canyon Road/94 – 90% of design is complete – Caltrans is dealing with the County and property owner to N doesn't want to sell. There are IODs on the other three corners. County needs to deed to Caltrans. The three intersections of Vista Diego, Vista Sage, and Otay Lakes Road improvements have been given to the County to handle and they are now working with Caltrans and the tribe to make them safe including a signalization and/or a roundabout at the Otay Lakes Road/SR94 intersection, and left turn lanes with acceleration and deceleration lanes at Vista Diego and Vista Sage. **Janet will contact Chi Vargas and invite him to a future JDCPG meeting to discuss SR94 and future improvements.**

**f. Michael Casinelli received a call from Jarrett Ramadi** regarding the old Simpson Farms property project and the County has put the project on hold and taking the problems and no-show at meetings seriously.

5. **AT&T CELL TOWER, PDS2017-MUP-17-018, 17822 Lawson Valley Rd, Jamul, APN 522-050-70-00 - Christian Ruvalcaba, Mitchell J Architecture - Jean Strouf** introduced the owner **Paula Roberts**, neighbor **Jon Ingram**, resident, **Joan Kouns**. **Jean Strouf** told the Planning Group that **Jon Ingram** sent an email to her pointing out his concerns especially with the fact that he did not know that the contact person was changed from Lucas to Christian. He restated his health concerns regarding the cell tower as well as possible drop in property value if the cell tower is constructed next to his property. He also pointed out that the change in location was not shared with the neighbors including him. **Jean Strouf** reported that **Christian** sent an email inviting neighbors for a walk around but none of the neighbors received the email. **Jean and Paula and Christian** walked the property to try to find another location they liked, but ATT could not use any other location on the property. The **Pipers** suggested another location and **Jean** is not sure if any of the neighbors liked it. As regarding the water tank (suggested by us) viz a viz a tree, **Jean Strouf** does not see a difference. This location seems to be the only place that ATT can successfully get the signals. **Christian Ravalcaba** pointed out that the area is now considered a dead zone and does not get cell service. This program is designed to give connection to all people. **Jean** asked what was to prevent ATT moving it for half a mile. **Christian** stated that the topography makes it difficult even moving within 100 feet. The chosen location has a straight shot to Lawson Valley Road and to move it even a half a mile would mean problems as there is no power in some of the areas. Basically this is the only area that would work.

**Eileen Poole** asked about the money paid to an owner when they agree to have a cell tower on their land and questioned whether the home values near to the cell tower might drop. **Christian** pointed out that the firm got the contract to put up cell towers for ATT who have the contract with the government to bring cell service and broadband to

the rural areas. **Jon Ingram** is concerned that his property will fall in value and he has no compensation whereas the owner will get compensation and yet his property will have the view shed which would include the 45 foot cell towers. **Joan Kouns** lives about half a mile farther and would not see nor get benefit from it. There are so many mountains around Lawson Valley, she asked why not put the tower on top of one of them, and then all residents in Lawson Valley would benefit? Four years ago when she was a member of Planning Group, ATT said they were going to do away with all landlines. However it has not been mandated by the state to get rid of landlines as of this date. She is also concerned that when ATT put a cell tower in Deerhorn Valley, not everyone got service even though it was promised. There will still be dead spots.

**Joe Stuyvesant** asked how will the cell site be powered, and **Christian** said that the small 50KW generator was added. There are 80 vacant acres in the area that people have not built upon and they will have the problem of coverage there. He also pointed out that in a fire the reverse 911 calls must be able to be made through cell service. **Summer Piper** pointed out that to her cell service and Internet are both important for her job. **Preston Brown** asked if they would be happy with a location farther away from their house. **Jon Ingram** said he prefers the original location and feels that he is losing, because the owner feels it does not fit with her house. **Bill Herde** pointed out that they need to have a cell tower in the area and even though it will be in the view of the neighbors' houses, we do have an obligation to help to improve cell service. **Michael Casinelli** stated that these last three cell site locations that came before our Group were the only contentious ones he could remember. Others on the Group disagreed pointing out that there were others that were also contentious. **Michael** pointed out that alternative locations were supposed to be proposed and **Christian** said they all had the same problem. **Michael** asked how many neighbors would be affected by the view shed and **Jean** said that no others had been contacted. **Michael** asked what was wrong with the original site, and **Summer** said that wasn't the site she proposed. **Dan Neirinckx** asked if the original site would have structures within the fall line of the tree. **Michael** questioned the sims as the height of the building appears to be closer to the height of the tree. **Jean Strouf** moved that we recommend approval of the construction of the cell tower in the location proposed by ATT on boundary plan A-101. Motion did not pass: 4, yes; 5, no; Greenhalgh (not eligible to vote)

6. **THREE TREES REMOVAL** - 3245 Rancho Miguel Road - **Steve Nelson**, Vegetation Manager, County of San Diego made a report to **Michael**.- **Michael Casinelli** stated that **Steve Nelson** needed our recommendation in order to move the trees. **Michael Casinelli** moved we recommend removal of the three trees as they could be a safety hazard. Motion carried unanimously.
- 7 **PLDO** , Dept of Parks and Recreation would like to provide an update and receive feedback on the proposed changes to the PLDO and applicable Board Policies - **Marcus Lubich**, Senior Park Project manager, County of San gave an update to the PLDO Ordinance and the changes they are recommending to the BOS. The Advisory Committee met evaluating the existing plans which he presented to all Planning Groups and other groups to get ideas for the new PLDO ordinance. The State Act only applies to subdivision but the County wants it to apply to all developments. The fees will be charged equivalent to the taxes .The fees are used for rehabilitation, purchase of lands, and cannot be used for maintenance. 25% could be used for trails. Can't use for passive uses used in active spaces like workout areas, horseback, etc. Developers who want to

supply trails and scenic overlook, using steep slopes for trails, skate parks, etc., would be allowed half credit and it can only be up to 10%. Offsite mitigation land must be within 3 miles from development. Minimum park size 0.4 acres. Park design guidelines have been developed for percentage of improvements to areas. Creating new Board Policy compelling developers to provide parks. They will be required not to exceed 50% for parks. Does not consider manufacturing development. The Dept of Parks and Rec will put out their changes for preview to Planning Groups and then it will go to BOS for approval. They closed the loopholes to the mitigation. The 3-mile limit is pretty standard. The amount of PLDO money received by the areas should not increase or decrease in any way. **Dan Neirinckx** asked if we could review the new document and was told it will be available within 30 days of the proposal. **Hannah Gbeh** asked why Jamul does not have a park. It was pointed out that **Park land expansion** was not allowed unless there was a tax assessment district that could maintain the park, however the Board of Supervisors voted last year to build in maintenance for parks within their budget. **Michael Casinelli appointed Dan Neirinckx as chair of the PLDO subcommittee and Jean Strouf, Preston Brown and Bill Herde will serve on the committee.**

5. **OTAY WATER DISTRICT'S CAMPO ROAD SEWER REPLACEMENT PROJECT UPDATE - Paula Roberts, President Aqua Community Relations Group. Michael Casinelli introduced Paula Roberts** who was representing Otay Water District's Project Team. She presented a map that showed the Campo Road Sewer Replacement Project, highlighting areas of work completed and in progress. She reported that sensitive birds were found nesting on a portion of the alignment and said the birds historically leave before the end of September. Wier Construction will continue to work in areas without bird impacts, from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., Sunday nights through Friday mornings. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that the construction crew blocked the lanes with cones, even though it was months before the work started. **Paula Roberts** explained that location crews discovered a gas line was in a different spot than shown in the plans, which required redesign for a boring pit; traffic control was left in place for safety reasons. Several members commented on daytime lane closures near stored equipment; Paula explained Caltrans requires a 15-foot safety cushion around the equipment. She will come back to provide updates before crews begin the next segment and tunnel, which is planned for September.

6. **JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE UPDATE – Michael Casinelli pointed out that the Town Hall Meeting last week, Pat Webb talked about the four lawsuits that are still pending stating that they may have rulings by the Fall.** They include Federal suit stating the land does not qualify for class III gaming and JIV is not a tribe eligible for operating a casino, the Caltrans lawsuit for violation of CEQA, the ABC liquor license appeal, and the lawsuit for Karen's & Walter's illegal family remains removal . There is a slide show online from the meeting that is available on the JAC website.

7. **JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS: Michael announced he has two other projects to assign. PDS 2018 - MUP18-008 – TPM 21262 –Hix Snedeker, Jamul LLC Woodcrest Real Estate Ventures Steve Powell Jean Strouf and Darren Greenhalgh will co-chair.**

**PDS2018-TPM-21263. Lot Split - Proctor Valley Road – Bill Herde will chair and contact the County for more information.**

8. **Adjournment: Michael Casinelli adjourned the meeting the meeting at 9:46.**
9. **Respectfully submitted, Janet Mulder, Secretary**

**NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

**7:30 P.M. TUESDAY, May 8, 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.