

**JAMUL DULZURA
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

Final Minutes

Tuesday April 28, 2020

Approved May 12, 2020

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

7:30 p.m.

- 1. Dan Neirinckx, Chair called the virtual meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.**
- 2. ROLL CALL:**

Present: Dan Neirinckx, Janet Mulder, Joe Stuyvesant, Steve Wragg, Kevin May, Michael Casinelli, Eve Nasby, Preston Brown, Streeter Parker, Ed Mollen, Darrin Greenhalgh, Summer Piper.

Absent: 0

Excused: 0

Vacant Seats: 9,13, &14
- 3. APPROVAL** of the Agenda for April 28, 2020 and Final Minutes for the meeting of APRIL 14, 2020 Darren Greenhalgh moved we approve. Motion carried unanimously.
- 4. OPEN FORUM:**
 - a. Preston Brown** had trouble getting in to make his comments so Dan held Preston's input until later in the meeting.
- 5. CA SENATE BILL 743 PRESENTATION BY COUNTY PDS, Eric Lardy, Chief of Advance Planning, introduced his team from the County to us. Jacob Armaston, Chief of Land Development; Robb Efird, Project Manager, Advance Planning; Damon Davis, Planner III, Land Development; Rouys Rasolzadeh, Planner II, Advance Planning; Steve Cook. Chen Ryan, Consultant for County; Katy Cole Fehr and Peers, Consultant for County; Dawn Wilson, Michael Baker, International, Consultant for County.** They showed a video which dealt with Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) the concept which will be used in CEQA rulings rather than the LOS (Level of Service) which is used today. The video emphasized, *"The current practice of evaluating traffic transportation impacts uses on road congestion or level of service (LOS). SB 743 will require the amount of driving and length of trips – as measured by "vehicle miles traveled" or VMT – be used to assess transportation impacts on the environment for CEQA review. These impacts will be reduced or "mitigated" by options such as increasing transit, providing for active transportation such as walking and biking, and*

participating in mitigation banks. There are limited comparisons state-wide, but the majority of early adopters have used VMT which has maintained a 15% reduction; and exempted projects producing low VMTs. They have adopted various methods of transportation demand. The challenges of using this VMT method could be possible inconsistencies in methodology, but the County will implement SB742 applying it to new CEQA review standards.

There are three areas that need guideline components, including geography, to determine their VMT. One idea is to utilize VMT by geographic area recognizing that the unincorporated areas have less traffic. This would mean that the San Diego Regional Area would be 15% below 28.6 and the unincorporated area would be 15% below 31.2. Or another option is to break down the unincorporated area into sub areas. It would be broken into 5 sub-areas. Subarea 1 includes Western portion of San Diego, including San Dieguito, Crest-Dehesa, Valle de Oro, Spring Valley and Sweetwater. Subarea 2 includes South County, Subarea 3 is Central Coastal including Barona, Subarea 4 is in North County, Subregion 5 includes the back country which would not need to reduce its VMT in the scenario presented.

Projects likely to have a VMT impact include residential projects in remote locations as the VMT analysis looks at type, number of units, number ADTs generated by the development.

Analysis using the LOS approach looks at and evaluates road network performance, analyzes impacts to traffic flow at intersections and road segments, as well as noting that increased impacts result in greater amount of vehicle delay (congestion). It can be reduced and mitigated by increasing road capacity. When comparing VMT to LOS, there are long term implementations that are problematic options for Board consideration. The staff is suggesting a study be completed of local mobility analysis, present findings of programmatic VMT mitigations, make a mitigation bank of TIF ideas. PDS will have multiple public meetings with CPG and Sponsor Groups, Environmental Groups and the Industry Associates before it goes to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

Eric Lardy said the plan is that they are going to the Planning Commission on May 15 and Board of Supervisors on June 24. **Preston Brown** asked Eric to send the presentation to us so we would be able to make comments. (The url is attached here... <https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/SB743.html>.) **Janet Mulder** asked if the VMT would be more strict or less strict than LOS....**Eric Lardy** said they were working on mitigation as they would be using different criteria. **Damon Davis** looked at what Jamul would face as they would be looking outside of CEQA. For example, Village 13, would have had less hurdles in the process as it is located closer to more population. **Janet Mulder** pointed out that it would seem then that the VMT was ignoring the problems concerned with the high LOS score of SR94 in their analysis. **Eric Lardy** felt it would be possibly easier for Casa de Oro to use VMT than the back-county areas including Jamul Dulzura. **Summer Piper** asked what the VMT in Jamul looks like it, as she felt it would be easier to get more density using VMT than LOS. Sidewalks, bike lanes, and car pools,

which were suggested as a possible mitigation to VMT, seem to be totally out of place in our rural area. **Eric Lardy** did a screen share in which he showed that **VMT** is about looking at averages and this would mean that Jamul would not be compared to Spring Valley but compared more to areas like Alpine or Ramona. Size of the project would be determined through Traffic Analysis Zone where projects will have their subareas. **Steve Wragg** pointed out that VMTs will vary greatly depending on where they are located. They will require mitigation measures and it may be difficult to achieve. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that it is a state law and the state wants to get people out of their cars but in the back county, the addition of sidewalks or bike lanes will not mitigate the problems. Village 14 is a project we are all familiar with and **Michael** wondered how it would have fared if CEQA used VMTs? Would it have required higher fees? **Stephen Cook** pointed out that Village 14 was on a threshold and it depended upon where you compared it too. Providing retail and onsite school helps to make the VMT less of a problem. **Michael** asked **Eric** to share with the Planning Group what the regional boundaries would be and its impact. **Eric** agreed to get the information to us.

Kevin May pointed out that the City of San Diego had started their VMT and asked **Eric** how that would impact us? **Eric** said that it is a quite different dynamic from the unincorporated parts of the County. **Steven Cook** spoke on it. **Kevin May** asked if we will have any input into the mitigation bank monies. **Eric Lardy** said that our input that would be considered was mostly in the area of development. We would also have comments on individual projects. **Eve Nasby** thanked them for being here. She did question if the areas would impact on each other. **Katy Cole** said in VMT they are really measuring the number of trips and the distance they travelled. They are trying to reduce the number of miles travelled. **Ed Mollen** also thanked the County people for coming and giving us the information. He feels it doesn't take into account the increased numbers of trips necessary in the back county as the VMT is really dependent upon where the people live and go to work or shop. **Katy Cole** stated that if the VMT is going down, it shows that it is a different measure than we are used to using. The problem is that more rural areas would not be helped by VMT as the residents' travel would not be decreased with sidewalks as we are too far out. **Ed** points out that they are not looking at the capacity of the road and the problems it brings. **Katy** points out that the VMT will be better in the more developed area but did note that the mitigation will not put in new stoplights or improved highways. **Steve Wragg** announced that his company is under contract with County on this project. If we were voting he would need to abstain. **Dan Neirinckx** feels that they need to look at the amount of time spent in travel as a result of added ADT to an already impacted road. We need to mitigate and not ignore. **Preston Brown** pointed out that at the Planning Commission meeting on Village 13 he challenged the fact that they were assuming all people would be travelling south to Chula Vista area, and not looking at going north. He asked if they will look at the traffic model and **Eric Lardy** said they would be looking at the models. **Dan** thanked the entourage from the County for their input and asked **Eric Lardy** to keep us informed.

6. **OTAY RANCH VILLAGE 13 TRAFFIC STUDY**, **Dan Neirinckx** reported that this project will be going to the Planning Commission on May 24 – It will be brought up at our meeting on May 12. In the paperwork, they discuss Otay Lakes Road and SR 94 where they recognize the problem but have not given any mitigation for the unacceptable traffic increase. **Preston Brown** pointed out that Caltrans had recommended a stop light and he felt that they had not followed safety precautions by not addressing that dangerous intersection. They have not included SR94 and we need to get them to address it. **Steve Wragg** agreed that SR94 at Otay Lakes Road is a very dangerous intersection at this point. Making a left hand turn from Otay Lakes Road to SR94 going West is taking one's life in one's hands. **Janet Mulder** reminded us that from the early hearings on the Casino traffic, that intersection was always included as one that needed a signal light. **Michael Casinelli** listened to the Planning Commission Hearing and one of the commissioners made the point that there were no CPGs or CSGs located in the Village 13 project area, but that the project does impact a neighboring community that does have a CPG, and that the CPG should have been included in the County's solicitation of comments so that they could have responded as a CPG. **Preston Brown** pointed out that there were two of the Planning Commissioners who questioned the speed with which they needed to make their recommendation, but were outvoted by the rest of the PC. Several JDCPG members asked to form a sub-committee to look at the Study on this project. **Preston Brown, Summer Piper, Janet Mulder, Michael Casinelli, and Streeter Parker will be the sub-committee appointed by the Chair.**
7. **PLANNING GROUP MISSION STATEMENT:** **Kevin May** presented a proposed mission statement including a Proposed Purpose Statement for the public which reads as follows:

Jamul-Dulzura Community Planning Group

Proposed Mission Statement: describes the official goal of our group, and is intended primarily for use by our group.

Proposed Purpose Statement: derived from the mission statement, it describes in more detail the purpose for the group, so that the public can have a better understanding of what we do.

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 twofold. The first is to encourage public participation in the county's decision-making process by providing a public forum where local citizens can come to learn about issues of importance to them and their community, as well as voice any concerns they may have. The second is to take that input from the community and advise the county on such issues as planning and land use matters, discretionary projects and community and sub-regional plans.

Comments from the Planning Group members included “great job” and some suggested changes. Kevin will receive input, make changes, if necessary, and then the Planning Group will take a vote at the next meeting and establish our JDCPG Mission Statement and send it to the County.

8. JDCPG OFFICER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

Michael Casinelli suggested starting our meetings a half hour earlier to accommodate the lengthy Zoom entries....**Steve Wragg** suggested that we could accomplish the same thing if we had the Planning Group members check in and log in early so we can start at 7:30....**Dan Neirinckx** encouraged all to call in by 7:15 so we could start the meeting on time.

Bill Herde told Dan that he would help anyone having difficulty checking into the meeting. You would need to call Bill for help.

Dan Neirinckx reminded us that we are down three members and encouraged us to contact anyone we felt would be good on the group...They can fill out the application online and would need in addition to filling out a application, file a form 700, and take the Ethics and County Training online. While this sounds like a lot, it doesn’t take much time, and we have some interesting projects coming up that may have a major impact on our area!

Janet Mulder announced that she had received a letter from Supervisor Greg Cox as Chairman congratulating her for having been selected as one of the “2020 Volunteers of the Year for the County of San Diego”. They normally have a “Volunteer Recognition Service” but due to the Covid-19 it has been cancelled for this year. She received a large gold medal embossed with “Outstanding Volunteer of the Year” and a plaque signed by all the San Diego County Supervisors. They told her that a profile of her accomplishments would be highlighted online at www.sandiegocounty.gov/volunteer.html. She sent a letter of appreciation for the award to the Greg Cox, Chair of Board of Supervisors, and was congratulated by all. **Eve Nasby** asked Janet to have a photo taken and send it to her so she could post it on the JDCPG Facebook page and send it to *The Jamul Shopper*.

Steve Wragg brought up the importance of individual members not sharing their opinions with other members via email or phone calls as it could be a violation of the Brown Act. We should be very careful to only present to the Group at the actual meetings. **Preston Brown** said that he felt that he was reporting what was said at a public meeting (the Planning Commission this time) and therefore not violating the Brown Act. **Dan Neirinckx will contact County Counsel** for their opinion and share it at the next meeting.

Summer Piper suggesting use the “chat” function to be able to take a roll call vote. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that the County told him he needed to do a roll call vote for each motion and it should be recorded that way.

Summer Piper reported that they are starting on the cell tower in Lawson Valley and she will keep us informed as to progress.

Adjournment: Dan Neirinckx, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 9:28 reminding us that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 12, 2020 and will be a Zoom meeting again next time.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Mulder, Secretary

NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

7:30 P.M. TUESDAY MAY 12, 2020

SITE: If still in quarantine, it will be another virtual meeting. Info to follow.

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