

**JAMUL DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP  
FINAL MINUTES – SPECIAL MEETING  
JUNE 18, 2019  
APPROVED JULY 9, 2019  
Oak Grove Middle School Library  
7:30 p.m.**

1. **Dan Neirinckx, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:42 p.m.**

2. **ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Michael Casinelli, Janet Mulder, Dan Neirinckx, Eve Nasby, Preston Brown, Darren Greenhalgh, Summer Piper, Streeter Parker, Steve Wragg, Joe Stuyvesant, : Ed Mollen and Hannah Gbeh

**Absent:**

**Excused,** Richard Marzec & Kevin May

**Vacant Seat: 14.**

3. **APPROVAL** of the agenda for SPECIAL MEETING June 18, 2019. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. **OPEN FORUM**

a. **Hannah Gbeh – Facebook page** doing great but watch tone of the posts and be sure we are using the facts.

b. **Michael Casinelli** went to the SANDAG Transportation Committee meeting which included three CPGs and a few others. Slide presentation on SR125 was given and **Supervisor Dianne Jacob** spoke as well. Funding has been approved for 9 million, (now would be budgeted for 12 million) but the total budget is \$132 million, which includes the right of way for moving utilities. SDG&E is supposed to pay for part of any utilities needing to be moved. It looks like it will be about 3 months before it comes before the SANDAG Board. The more they delay this project, the more it will cost!

c. **Dan Neirinckx announced that Tara Lieberman, PDS, would be here** at the next meeting to brief our Group on the proposed small cell tower ordinance.

5. **Village 14 and PLANNING AREAS 16 & 19, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS June 26, 2019 MEETING Letter and Presentation from JDCPG**

**Dan Neirinckx** read the latest version of the draft letter created by the Sub-committee to the BOS in which we listed our additional concerns regarding this project. The discussion opened up with **Steve Wragg** as he was concerned about the tone of the letter. His concern is that the County determined that the project did adhere to County Fire Standards. He feels that the JDCPG should not determine if the project adheres to the standards as set forth by the Environmental Groups. This project meets the County standards and **Mark Slovick** is here from the County and could shed some light on the County standards and whether or not the review was held. **Mark Slovick** stated that the County Fire Authority reviewed the plan to make sure it meets the County standards

and they have done that and deemed it acceptable, and they also included the letter from Dan Silver (Endangered Habitats League). **Joe Stuyvesant** agrees with **Steve** that the County did a review on this project and feels that since the County has already reviewed this information and found it satisfactory, it is not our place to question it. The MSCP information may not tie into the letter and the fire issue. His opinion is there is a fine line we as elected members of the community that represent our community walk, and we should be objective and look at all sides of an issue and then vote on what is best for the community, and not advocate for one side or the other, stating “We are not an advocacy group”. **Summer Piper** pointed out that the Fire Chief told us they reviewed the project, but did not look at the possibility of a fire that would involve the community of Jamul as well as the casino’s use of the highway in an emergency, which she felt was a mistake. **Hannah Gbeh** feels we are missing a good opportunity to speak with the Board and would like to propose an edited version of the letter to include the concern of the evacuation time, deleting the concerns that are more controversial and end with the point that our concerns were not addressed therefore we are asking to have it remanded back to Staff. **Darren Greenhaugh** feels that we need to especially address the fact that they did not address our concerns regarding the Proctor Valley Road improvements as well as the improvement to eleven offsite roadway intersections. **Dan Neirinckx** contacted **Randal Sjoblon** about the legality of adding information to our BOS presentation, and he stated that it was fine to express our concerns based on information presented today. The additional concerns are within our purview to discuss. We are not changing our vote, but alerting the BOS to the new set of information we received since our vote. The BOS is the one that will make the recommendation and if they feel that our position is valid, then they can change it. This is not “out-of-line” with our purview of our job as PG members. **Preston Brown** got the information from experts that **Dan Silver**, Executive Director of the Endangered Habitats League, had been hired do independent studies. The Sub Committee interviewed them at length, and points out that the facts are there. He reminded us we were forced to make a quick vote, which was unnecessary as it turns out. Preston reminded us that he had invited Dave Nissen, Cal Fire Chief to our last meeting and thanked him for his valuable input into how fire emergencies evacuations are handled by the department and on advice of what we can do. However, he reiterated that Dave Nissen stated that Cal Fire can only do so much in fighting these fire and that beyond that point the “**End User**”, the community, has to take responsibility for its itself, its own survival. **Preston** continued stating, the MSCP was set up to protect the wildlife and our Plan demands this by wanting to remain rural. The 156-page document was partially written by our **Supervisor, Dianne Jacob**, and it addresses the impacts of growth and building on all preserved land in East County. The other partners in the MSCP, the CFW and the USFW have strenuously objected to the taking of the property by this developer, including all private conservation groups. On the other hand, City of Chula Vista, a former stakeholder, who had profited from the land swaps that secured PV1,2 &3 into permanent “No Take” status, was stunned but more mild in asking in four separate paragraphs, ‘What is your intention? You are violating a long-standing agreement’. Part of the new information is the horrendous destruction of property in recent fires. People could be trapped in one of these fires. The Jamul Casino nor Simpson Farms development and their traffic were not taken into consideration when they looked at fire problems. The **CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS - 14 CCR § 15126.2** clearly shows that the EIR must take into

consideration any potentially significant impact in fire hazard areas and look at cumulative impacts. The two-lane highway would be burdened way beyond its original designed and intended use. Important to know that hardening of structures proposed is not sufficient and the developer may be using inadequate or outdated information. The latest fires seem to suggest that there are problems with structure hardening actually being fire resistant as structures built to the highest codes burned down in many cases equally as older homes in the same areas. **Ed Mollen** pointed out that he was not on the Planning Group when the vote was taken, and his concern is that when a road hits the “bottom” there seems to be no additional impact when a road is at the worst level. He has seen SR94 becoming worse and worse and with the proposed developments we can’t just rely on the fact that it already is an “F” and he suggests that especially in an emergency this could spell disaster. **Eve Nasby** would have assumed that the Fire Experts would have taken the current population into consideration and the fact that they did not is very concerning to her as it could be a life or death concern. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that the job of the Planning Group is to consider public safety, community character, representing the community and speak to the County for our community. The policies may be inadequate and it is our job to call these problems into consideration to the County. **Dave Nissen** said that the FPP,(fire protection plan) “meets the policy” which is that the people can all get out but it doesn’t take into consideration the other traffic on the road. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that PDS misrepresented our position twice at the Planning Commission and appeared to interfere with our audio-visual presentation. He further reported that **Rob Cameron** had contacted an individual member of our Group to check on the effectiveness of possible mitigation and the member did respond to him. **Rob Cameron** did not contact the Chair, and Jackson Pendo was a client of the company for which the Planning Group member works. **Rob Cameron** communicated ex parte with **Hannah Gbeh** and this bothered **Michael Casinelli**. **Hannah Gbeh** told us that **Jackson Pendo** was a client of the firm in which she had worked many years ago, but not since she worked for them. **Michael** suggested the name of the firm should not be on the website and **Hannah Gbeh** offered to recuse herself if that is a problem. **Hannah Gbeh** said she has worked for REC Consultants for seven years and has not dealt with Jackson Pendo, even though they are listed as client on website, but would like to recuse herself to avoid any appearance of conflict. In the future if any Group member is concerned about the possible recusal, she would appreciate being noticed before a vote was to be taken so she would not have to be at the meeting and would be excused from attending. Dan said that he spoke to Hannah before the meeting began about recusing herself due to a perceived conflict of interest, and Hannah told him there was no conflict. **Hannah Gbeh recused herself at this point and left the meeting to avoid an appearance of conflict.**

**Streeter Parker** pointed out that the **conditional approval** on the July 24, 2019 meeting is what the letter should emphasize. The fire information given by **Dave Nissen** in **Streeter’s** experience is that he is an excellent and effective person to give information and focuses on his career as a firefighter rather than the applicant’s position as is his right. **Dan Neirinckx** also pointed out that **Dave Nissen** was always very professional! **Janet Mulder** reminded the Group that Planning Groups were originally created to represent the ideas, desires and wishes of their communities to the County Planners so that San Diego PDS, then known as DPLU, would not have to work in a vacuum but would have representation in the outlying communities that would alert them to prior and

existing problems that would impact their decisions as to development in the outlying areas. This occurred in the 70's when the first election was held at which she was elected and has served on JDCPG since then. Therefore it is important that the Planning Groups today accurately represent their communities and relay that knowledge to the decision makers. In this case, the JDCPG questioned the validity of the testing for septic systems, especially since the JDCPG Community Plan calls for "no sewers" as well as the traffic analysis which did not seem to take into consideration the obvious "short cut" for the people who would be living in the proposed development which would lead them to the already overburdened SR94. In addition, the evacuation plan in case of fire did not take into account the ambient traffic that exists today on SR94 with its bumper-to-bumper traffic under normal conditions that would be exacerbated in an emergency situation. To suggest it is not only feasible, but allowable to add thousands of vehicles onto a road rated "F" is inexcusable! She felt our letter to the BOS should remind them of the total concerns our community has regarding this project.

**Neal Thornton, Melody Road resident**, was at the Planning Commission meeting and wants to recommend that the Planning Group should be an advocate for the community at the BOS meeting. His concern is that the Planning Group voted to approve **with conditions**, and that seems to have been lost in interpretation. He is concerned that the Whispering Meadows road is private and at the Planning Commission they agreed that the traffic study was not done as it did not make the threshold for necessity. He feels the building plans and the layout are both good, but the **traffic study is totally inadequate and needs to be addressed**. Even the Planning Commission disagreed with the traffic study, but staff said that the traffic followed the model they were assigned, so it was used. **Andrea Harris, Valley Knolls Road** resident, would like to second **Neal Thornton's** concerns and listened to the comments after the meeting and pointed out that there was no Whispering Meadows and Valley Knolls work proposed and the Commissioner took the Planner's word for it even though the study was flawed. She compares it to the **Paradise Fire** problems in case of fire as the evacuation problems are similar.

**Mark Slovick, SD County** pointed out that they were taking into consideration the concerns raised about evacuating the existing community and the proposed community and evaluate it as a whole. **Ed Mollen** questioned the assumption that the new community would evacuate to Chula Vista, which would mean using the toll road, was logical. **Summer Piper** pointed out that the project people would probably use SR94 rather than go through Chula Vista and that is not considered in the FEIR.

**Michael Casinelli** asked what the Group wants to do at the BOS meeting. He reminded us that at the Planning Commission they were told that they had "no problem" with Fire Protection Plan and yet there could be problems as we have identified here tonight.

**Dan Neirinckx** moved we accept the letter as written by the sub-committee and modified at the meeting to go to the Board of Supervisors. Motion carried: 11, yes; 0, No; 1 Recused (Hannah Gbeh); 2 absent, 1 seat vacant. The letter is attached to these minutes.

**Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that all of the statements in the letter represent concerns of our community and as Chair, he will head the presentation to the Board of Supervisors on June 26 and asked **Michael Casinelli and Janet Mulder** to be a part of this presentation, assuming the Board of Supervisors Chair will allow adequate time for a JDCPG presentation.

**Adjournment: Chair Dan Neirinckx adjourned the meeting at 10:20 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Janet Mulder, Secretary**

**JDCPG LETTER TO SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RE OTAY VILLAGE:  
JAMUL DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP  
P. O. BOX 613, JAMUL, CA 91935**

June 18, 2019

San Diego County Board of Supervisors  
1600 Pacific Highway  
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Otay Ranch Village 14 and Planning Areas 16 and 19 DEIR. PDS 2016-GPA-16-008; PDS2016-SP-16-002; PDS2016-REZ-16-006; PDS2016-TM-5616; PDS2016-ER-16-19-006; PDS2016 STP-16-027.

Dear Supervisors,

At the July 24, 2018 regular meeting of the Jamul Dulzura Community Planning Group (JDCPG), we recommended **CONDITIONAL** approval of Village 14 and Planning areas (PA) 16 & 19 by a vote of 11 to 1 with the following conditions:

1. No sewer within PA 16 and 19 without detailed perc testing for each lot, which would preclude the use of a standard or alternate septic system;
2. Provide offsite traffic mitigation to reduce roadway, pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle hazards between Echo Valley and SR-94, specifically along the eleven (11) intersections identified within the JDCPG Letter on the Draft EIR, dated April 12, 2018.

Of the many concerns expressed by the JDCPG of the DEIR, these two issues were the most urgent. Improvements to reduce the negative impacts of the additional traffic generated by this development to the existing Proctor Valley Road and other intersections on SR 94 are critical. This negatively impacts our daily lives and fails to recognize the capacity of existing roads, especially the northern emergency evacuation routes, which use the existing substandard two-lane country road. The road system and evacuation routes should be improved, not degraded, as a result of this development.

In light of the very tragic wildfires of 2018 and prior, the County policy related to fire protection plan (County Consolidated Fire Code) falls well short of a cumulative comprehensive approach to the safety of the project and surrounding communities. Recent building codes that call for "hardening" of structures do NOT eliminate those structures from igniting. The science and statistics from Cal Fire show this "hardening

theory” to be overstated. The design of “Traffic Circles” to slow traffic movement within the project will also slow down evacuation efforts. The idea that adding traffic to a roadway that has been graded and evaluated as a category “F” level is acceptable, gives lip service to public safety when a wildfire evacuation delay will not only increase travel time, but **will cost lives!** Off project road safety along Proctor Valley Road from project to SR94 and through Whispering Meadows Lane/Valley Knolls Road cannot be ignored, as both normal and evacuation traffic will further degrade public safety.

**Therefore, due to the above concerns, the Jamul Dulzura Community Planning Group urges the Board of Supervisors to consider these critical issues before making a decision, and re-evaluate the existing policy regarding community evacuation in an emergency for future projects.**

Thank you,

Dan Neirinckx, Chair,  
Jamul Dulzura Community Planning Group

**NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

**7:30 P.M. TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2019**

**OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL LIBRARY**

**Meeting minutes and agendas can be accessed at**

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

**Meeting minutes and agendas can be accessed at**

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

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.