

**JAMUL DULZURA  
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP  
FINAL MINUTES  
Tuesday May 26, 2020**

**APPROVED June 23, 2020**

**\*\*\*\*\*VIRTUAL MEETING\*\*\*\*\***

**7:30 p.m.**

**1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Dan Neirinckx opened the virtual meeting at 7:30 p.m**

**2. ROLL CALL:**

**Present: Dan Neirinckx, Janet Mulder, Joe Stuyvesant, Steve Wragg, Kevin May,  
Michael Casinelli, Eve Nasby, Ed Mollen, Streeter Parker, Preston Brown,**

**Absent: Darrin Greenhalgh,**

**Excused: Summer Piper.**

**Vacant Seats: 9,13, &14**

**Visitors: Mark Slovick, Greg Mattson, Deputy Chief Dave Nissen, and Chief Tony Meachum.**

**3. APPROVAL of the Agenda for May 26, 2020 and Final Minutes for the meeting of May 12, 2020, Dan Neirinckx moved approval of both. Motion carried unanimously.**

**4. OPEN FORUM**

**a. Mark Slovick** suggested that **Chief Tony Meachum and Deputy Chief Dave Nissen** give their report as the subject is not on the Agenda. **Tony Meachum** spoke first and told us that as we knew, evacuating Jamul would be a problem, which has been helped by the work on Proctor Valley Road. They are trying to hit a plan where the fire is located will determine the time of evacuation rather than someone on the ground. When we need to evacuate we can go to the grids on the Thomas Guide rather than waiting to alert dwellers. They are working on a plan for Jamul which will have all residents leaving via Proctor Valley Road rather than SR94. **Dave Nissen** agrees that evacuation greater Jamul, for the residents of Whispering Meadows, etc. would be better through Proctor Valley Rd. However from the school and farther out it makes more sense to go SR94. The area out farther still would use Otay Lakes Road to evacuate. **Dave Nissen** told us that their new grid plan is very successful in getting people to the site quickly and coordinating with the Sheriff Department. They are looking at making it the safest way out. **Preston Brown** asked how would they control the choices motorist make like at four corners or the Otay Lakes/SR94 double T intersections. **Dave Nissen** said that they will have an officer at each of the intersections to direct traffic in the right direction. It will take a lot of officers, but it would work. **Preston Brown** asked about the original plan (which is still in effect) as it did not take in to account the ambient traffic and evacuation on Proctor valley Road with residents of Jamul. We are waiting for the alternative report. **Tony Meachum** pointed out that they trying to move people out of Jamul and they are not considering using Proctor Valley Road until it is improved. Preston Brown also asked Chief Meacham if he has ever worked in the writing of a community fire evacuation plan. Chief Meacham replied that he has reviewed them and advised on them. Preston Brown asked why the County Planners are allowing Village 13 to defer making a "Community Evacuation Plan" till after the building phase is completed. Chief Meacham said he would defer to County Planners.

**6. OTAY RANCH VILLAGE 14 MSCP RELATED REVISIONS**

**Amendment going to the BOS on June 3: Preston Brown** asked why the County is doing this without complete agreement between the developer and the Wildlife Agencies? **Mark Slovick** said that if the BOS approves then they will process the MSCP amendment, and process the agreement of the Wildlife Agencies and the developer. **Steve Wragg** asked if this is the usual method, and **Mark Slovick** pointed out that if they do not come to agreement the project reverts back to the original plan. **Preston Brown** pointed out that the ambient traffic and the evacuation of Jamul residence was not taken into consideration in the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan. He reported that **Griffin** commented that the report needs to be updated and include the community of Jamul. **Joe Stuyvesant** objected to **Preston**

**Brown** bringing up other things not with MSCP as it is not on the agenda. **Dan Neirinckx** said that he did not want to stifle anyone, but a vote would only be concerning MSCP revisions. **Preston Brown** asked if only the MSCP is what we can talk about? **Joe Stuyvesant** suggested that what **Preston** is talking about was part of our discussion which came before our Group in January, and was voted on. He pointing out that there were statements about each area and they came up with no environmental impacts that would require change or mandatory funding. **Preston Brown** pointed out that changes in the document are marked with an asterisk and there are numerous portions that have been altered. He stated that this PPA was not just about the MSCP. The County Planners cannot rewrite the EIR under the guise of just updating the negotiations with the Applicant and the WCB. **Dan Neirinckx** reminded us that it was only recently this was posted to the public and therefore had been unavailable until recently. **Greg Matson** told us that all had been taken into consideration and the County has done “everything they can to let the public know what is happening”. **Dan Neirinckx** reminded us that the County’s report came out after the Planning Commission meeting and he feels that the public has the right to look at the revisions and make comments on it. **Preston Brown** pointed out that the CFW paid 24 million dollars for the land that it is now being asked to trade away and want to know how much the developer is going to pay them. **Mark Slovick** pointed out that the cost of the land is not included in the property agreement. That the WCB will determine that at the meeting August in Sacramento. **Steve Wragg** suggested that some changes were made after the Planning Commission and he asked the gentlemen from the County to respond as they found there were no significant immitigable impacts. **Mark Slovick** pointed out that there are no major changes, but the agreement as a whole, but in the Village 14 areas there was disagreement between the applicant and the Wild Life Agencies. The amendment is to solidify the agreement between them and to resolve the issues for PV1, 2, and 3. **Steve Wragg** asked **Preston** to go over what he saw as problems with the MSCP and **Preston Brown** asked if the other parts of the project could be discussed or just the MSCP? **Dan Neirinckx** said that was correct that only the MSCP was open for discussion. **Preston Brown** pointed out that he is concerned about this limitation as he sees it as a real problem. **Mark Slovick** pointed out that the County has proposed an amendment to the MSCP, which was part of the agreement made before it came before the BOS, and is discussed in the agreement made in June. **Preston Brown** commented that if he had to make a comment on the MSCP alone, it is that the whole thing stinks. The MSCP was meant to be a regional agreement and not a project by project negotiation at the last minute. Out of 15 Villages only one village is allowed to break all the rules. All the other villages honored the Baldwin Agreement and even Village 13 changed its EIR in 2019 to keep the preserves in-tact in their plan. **Eve Nasby** asked if we were voting on just the MSCP, then we could discuss the other changes that were made after the January meeting. **Joe Stuyvesant** disagreed and feels that the EIR is not changed by this alternative proposal.

**Dan Neirinckx** moved that the Planning Group vote to find no significant impact with the Amendment to the MSCP as posted recently by DPS. Yes: **Dan Neirinckx, Joe Stuyvesant, Steve Wragg, Kevin May, Streeter Parker and Ed Mollen**, No: **Preston Brown, Eve Nasby, Michael Casinelli and Janet Mulder**. Motion did not pass.

**Steve Wragg** said he wants it clear that if this is going to be on the next meeting agenda, the discussion has to be on the changes. **Preston Brown** said that he is concerned over the changes and wants us to discuss it. **Steve Wragg** said that changes had to be major and significant and not just crossing T’s and dotting I’s. **Mark Slovick** assured us that the changes were very minor and were efforts to clarify the language and wording etc., and there were no major changes. **Joe Stuyvesant** said we should realize that the County has put together an analysis County Checklist. **Mark Slovick** said it is an Addendum Checklist. **Greg Matson** pointed out that it was an EIR Agenda Check List which was given to the Planning Group and it indicates the changes. **Eve Nasby** asked if we should have a sub-committee meet on the changes? **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that our initial vote has not changed and **Preston Brown** reminded us that our vote was “conditional” and the County Staff misrepresented our vote as APPROVAL. He also said that relying on “checked boxes” does not give true picture of what is going on. **Michael Casinelli** suggested that staff prepare a list of pertinent items. **Kevin May** pointed out that we should ask Staff to give us a list of what was changed. **Steve Wragg** pointed out that since our next meeting is after the BOS meeting, he sees no point in having staff work up a list for us, as it would just mean work for them. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that people could attend and make comments at the BOS on June 3, 2020, as individuals, not representing the JDCPG.

## 7. JDCPG OFFICER’S ANNOUNCEMENT

- a. **Preston Brown** reported on the sub-committee meeting and pointed out that Rick Curry who spoke to the committee representing SANDAG, had worked for Caltrans

before he came to SANDAG, which he felt gave him a better perspective when creating the models. The sub-committee will be meeting with Roger Sanchez and others of Caltrans next week.

**b. Ethics - Dan Neirinckx** reminded all members of the JDCPG need to make sure their Ethics test is up to date (needs to be retaken every two years), that they have turned in their 700 form and reminded us that we all needed to take the County Training every year. We are required to have the training once in person and then use the online training.

**c. Michael Casinelli** asked **Chief Meachum** and **Deputy Chief Nissen** about the evacuation plan for Jamul-Dulzura they have created. He questioned how do you control the people leaving too soon or staying too long? **Chief Meachum** said they did not have the authority to force people to leave, rather they encourage them to do so especially if they have animals or health problems. They give an evacuation warning and encourage those people with animals or health problems to go then. He reflected that there was an over-evacuation in 1980, but every fire is different and decisions will be made at the time. **Dave Nissen** added that many of you took part in the evacuations and it was not convenient and is used as a last resort to keep people out of harm's way. **Michael Casinelli** asked if people who worked in town wanted to come home and pick up their children and animals would be allowed to return to their homes. **Chief Meachum** said that no one is allowed back into the evacuation area, but they would send law enforcement or fire personnel to help the people out as they would not knowingly leave anyone there, but they would not go back in to re-evacuate.

#### **ADJOURNMENT:**

**Dan Neirinckx, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m. thanking the gentlemen from the County and the Fire Department for coming to our meeting tonight and giving us input.**

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Mulder, Secretary

#### **NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

**7:30 P.M. TUESDAY June 9, 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.