

*****SPECIAL NOTICE*****

To take part in the VIRTUAL meeting call in by phone at
either 669-900-6833 Or 253-215-8782 by 7:20 pm.

When directed, enter the meeting ID: 821-2983-5128 and
Meeting Password: 828665

You will be place in a Queue until admitted by the Host. You will then be
placed on hold until the Meeting begins. When it is your turn to speak,
the host will say the last four digits of your phone number
and you will be permitted to speak at that time.

If you become disconnected, call back and
enter the appropriate ID and PW numbers.

*****SPECIAL NOTICE*****

COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

JAMUL DULZURA

FINAL MINUTES SPECIAL VIRTUAL MEETING

Tuesday June 2, 2020

Approved June 23, 2020

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

7:30 p.m.

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

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

Absent: Steve Wragg

Excused:

Vacant Seats: 9, 13, and 14
3. **APPROVAL** of the Agenda for June 2, 2020. **Preston Brown** moved to approve the minutes. Motion carried unanimously.
4. **OPEN FORUM:**
 - A. Dan invited the co-owners of Village 14 and Greg Mattson to the meeting, however they chose not to attend.
 - B. Michael Casinelli reported that the sub-committee had a meeting with SANDAG and then CalTrans today, and it was very informative. Preston asked if this could be put on the next agenda? Dan agreed to do it.
5. **OTAY RANCH VILLAGE 14, PAs 16 & 19 Project Amendment: Fire Safety:** **Preston Brown** sent 5 different documents of information to all of us and said **Preston Brown** stated he wanted to articulate the reason why we are here. He disagrees with **Dan** that special meetings like this should be evaluated on the basis of likelihood of success, of getting a majority vote. He stated: "In this case this is irrelevant to the large picture. It is vital for us to bring this information to light to our community. The community will forgive a split vote but never would it forgive us for not revealing and considering life safety information and not fighting for their "best interest". Then the public will show up with pitch forks and torches as they did with the Alpine Planning Group when they approved the "Blackwater" compound for paramilitary training. They had blood in their

eyes and got the votes reversed and resignation of members for not informing them. That is the light I feel we need to consider tonight's meeting, "the best interests of our community", win, lose or draw, they must be informed."

Preston Brown asked if we had received the information he sent to us this week. He stated, the most important surprise was the RHODE Report which was commissioned by the San Diego County Fire Authority. Most alarming is that their conclusions conflict with **Chief Meachum's** statement last meeting involving Proctor Valley Road. Items 4 and 5 in the Summary of Findings were particularly important.

Eve Nasby pointed out that the document has much new information that was concerning as they did not take into consideration those of us from Jamul evacuating in an emergency situation using Proctor Valley Road. She pointed out that they talked about 4700 cars per hour and did not take Jamul into consideration.

Summer Piper said that Proctor Valley Road was not listed as a potential evacuation route for people from Jamul, and in fact the report suggests that it should absolutely not be used by Jamul residents.

Darrin Greenhaugh disagreed and said he read that it was able to be used.

Eve Nasby saw a recommendation in the report that said the people in the Village would be able to "shelter in place", which she questioned.

Joe Stuyvesant said this was "partially correct" in that if they can't evacuate safely, they have mitigation in place for that. He also pointed out that Proctor Valley is not an evacuation route today, and it would be primarily for the new village, but available if necessary.

Ed Mollen reminded us that at our last meeting the Fire Department personnel told us that Jamul would not be able to use Proctor Valley Rd, but rather SR 94 or Otay Lakes Rd in an evacuation.

Summer Piper said that the report showed that people have not been evacuating on time and causing problems. Unless they are going to give the population directions as to where they should "shelter in place", it will be a real problem.

Eve Nasby read from Page 14, which says the safest route would be to Chula Vista. Evacuation by Jamul residents through the "North-bound evacuations into Jamul may be confounded by topographic conditions, wind-driven fire trajectory, and proximity to heavier fuels which may pose civilian entrapment risk. If travel on Proctor Valley Road may be compromised, it may be much safer to utilize temporary safe refuge areas within the Project development as a temporary population protection measure."

Kevin May had a question about the listing of "four available lanes" and there are only two lanes from Jamul. **Dan Neirinckx** said that page 16 they mention 2 lanes and on page 5, paragraph 4, they use four lanes, so they do not have a handle on the actual size of Proctor Valley Rd. Perhaps the report needs to be modified to show that the actual size of the road would determine the effectiveness of the evacuation plan. The Rhode Report inaccurately says that the road is 4 lanes, and needs to be modified to show the actual size of the road. **Summer Piper** said that the evacuation plan calls for route to Chula Vista to the south via Proctor Valley Road, which has four lanes coming from the development to Chula Vista and two lanes going to the north towards SR94. **Michael Casinelli** interpreted the four lanes vs two lanes counts on utilizing all lanes going to the south and they have neglected to leave a lane for emergency vehicles that would need to travel to the fire and against evacuees. When he read the EIR they had removed the minimum and maximum evacuation time estimates and all precautionary comments such as there might not be enough time for people to evacuate. All of this has been removed! **Eve Nasby** pointed out that the report does recognize this problem on page 15 where they admit that contra-flow is difficult and they did not take into consideration the possible problems of evacuating people from Jamul, and should only be undertaken during emergency conditions. On page 16 they speak about the difficulties and spoke about the problems of contra-flow which was attempted in the Paradise Fire. **Michael Casinelli** told us that in the Harris Fire there were problems with accidents blocking the lanes and tow trucks had a problem getting in.

Preston Brown reminded us that the other two reports by REAX, Griffin Code Transportation Consultants both stated that the new Proposed Plan Amendment, (PPA) is significantly changed from the previously approved EIR WF EP and suffers from the same deficiencies as the previous one. We were told at the last meeting by the County people that there were minor corrections and that is which is wrong, as large sections that had previously analyzed the inherent fire risks were deleted. **Joe Stuyvesant** asked why we were talking about other reports as the meeting was supposed to be about the RHODE report on fire safety. **Dan Neirinckx** said that the agenda reflects that we are to discuss

Fire Safety, and we will not go into design or other things not on the agenda, but the topic on these reports was on Fire Safety. **Preston Brown** sent out the report on **Griffin Cove Transportation Study** and the **REAX Report** to all of the Group. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that the title of the report states it is about Fire Evacuation. **Preston Brown** said that the report was not given out to the public until last Friday, and this information clearly states the deficiencies of the EIR-WILDLAND FIRE EVACUATION PLAN (WFEP) and that large portions of the fire evacuation plan were deleted in the new document, making it a new EIR that should be put out for public review. He feels this may be illegal. **Darrin Greenhaugh** stated that there are often changes to an EIR and the final version is not the only one they have, as they also have the draft EIR to refer to. **Eve Nasby** stated that the **Griffin Cove Transportation Consulting Report** has a summary of the time estimates and shows how they were flawed. **Joe Stuyvesant** said he thought it interesting that we could read the same report and come to different conclusions. He referred us to page 14, and gave a short summary, realizing there are always going to be possible problems or issues with evacuation. He felt the report echoed the report of the Fire Chief. **Dan Neirinckx** agrees with **Joe Stuyvesant** that while there are differences, he feels that they are relatively consistent. Perhaps we should recommend that the **RHODE Report** be looked at as an additional guide in the preparation of a fire evacuation and preparation plan, and he gave his interpretation of the differences, including sheltering in place within the project. **Preston Brown** suggested **Joe** needed to look at Section 4 and 5, not just 1,2 and 3, in the SUMMARY FINDINGS of the ROHDE Report which state:

4. Evacuation via Proctor Valley Road is the principal means available for evacuation of the community. The road paved width with proposed fuel modification should substantially enhance the resistance of this evacuation route to compromise by wildfire. However, under high-fire intensity conditions, fire trajectory may temporarily obstruct access to this route, and public safety officials will need to manage this roadway as fire conditions dictate. This route should not be utilized except as a last resort evacuation by the Community of Jamul. Such use would likely lead to significant congestion on this roadway. Potential wildfire entrapment risks due to terrain and fuels also exist on the roadway north of the Project.

5. Using the proponent's traffic studies, this study has identified that congestion is likely on Proctor Valley Road during major community evacuation using two traffic lanes outbound. Further, the proponent's traffic studies have not calculated potential impacts from evacuation traffic from nearby Jamul. Traffic studies have suggested that all four available traffic lanes be utilized for outbound traffic (contra-flow), however this requires substantial law enforcement and traffic control commitment to be safe or successful.

Preston Brown pointed out that there are differences as it concerns our community and we need to take them into consideration as the proposed WFEP strongly conflicts with the ROHDE Report and the two other third party independent Reports on the use of Proctor Valley Road as safe alternative route. It also conflicts with the statement from Chief Meham at our regular Meeting on May 26, that new "fire modelling suggests that Proctor Valley Road will be one of the primary routes for residents in Jamul." **Preston** pointed out that the opponents traffic study did not take into consideration the possible traffic from the community of Jamul. It is bringing up issues that will be important to us.

Dan Neirinckx asked the non-members speak after **Darrin Greenhaugh** who pointed out that the requirement for the CEQA document does not require the developer to evaluate the evacuation of Jamul proper, and does not require them to address the impacts on Jamul and are not part of the discussion in the County. **Janet Mulder** disagreed and pointed out that at all of the CEQA hearings that she has attended they did have to look at the impacts to surrounding property. **Darrin Greenhaugh** said they were required to look at the fires coming from the east and ones from the west as not a concern, but rather if the fire comes from Jamul the development should be evacuating through Chula Vista and not through Jamul. They found that having a fire break that is 80 to 140 feet wide (meaning Proctor Valley Road) and the fact that the road has large sides would be an advantage if the fire is coming from the north.

Dan opened up the comments to the public and called upon **Dr. Peter Anderson**, co-founder of Jamul Action Committee, and long-time resident in Jamul.

Dr. Anderson stated that he feels that the Group has missed the point; that this project should be denied. There has not been sufficient time to review, and the BOS should not consider it since there were so many major changes. The report states that the fire can come from many areas, and massive fire spreading, were not taken into consideration. Shelter-in-place has been shown to be dangerous. The Fire Chief cannot speak against it, as the development gave money to the Fire Department. **Dr. Anderson** feels that they have not been truthful in their analysis.

Bill Herde, former JDCPG member and community resident, said that this project has always had concerns with traffic. Their Fire Evacuation Plan is exacerbated with this and ignores this problem. There has been pertinent material that has been removed for the BOS and he feels the Griffin Cove Report clearly shows there were errors. Shelter-in-place should be a last resort and has never been used in San Diego, and would possibly mean that people would panic and people may want to get out of the area, no matter what. He suggested that the BOS should be informed of the massive changes before they make a decision to decide whether or not there is information missing and that they should have all information in front of them before they make a decision of this magnitude. **Bill Herde** concluded with the following questions: Why was this information in a previous report and not here? Is it deliberate misrepresentation?

Preston Brown pointed out that the REAX Report does show a very detailed map where the fires have started and gave historical information on a fire coming from the west. This would mean residents from Village 14 would have to evacuate through Jamul. Their EIR also does not take into consideration the interaction and impacts of Jamul and Casino traffic on an evacuation through Proctor Valley Road.

Summer Piper explained fire behavior is impacted hugely by Santa Ana winds. If you look at the topography of Proctor Valley Road, it is like a canyon; there are mountains on both sides, which means “chimneys” would be created. If a fire starts outside of the valley, it will probably not go into the valley, as fire does not burn downhill, but conversely if it starts in the valley it will flash through the valley and right up into the development areas. **Ed Mollen** pointed out that Jamul is already rated one of the worst areas to evacuate, and he feels there would be traffic coming from the development into Jamul to avoid traffic going south. **Eve Nasby** points out that they looked at the fire safety for their development but did not take into consideration the problems of the people of Jamul and how it would impact us. They would put us into a tinderbox.

Joe Stuyvesant felt that the members were saying “Don’t build Village 14 because of these fire issues.” He pointed out that Proctor Valley Road is not on the agenda and he “heard from our comments” that there should not be building, but we, as a Group, have already considered that decision and voted on it. **Preston Brown** asked Joe who was it on the Group that said the developer “should not be building Village 14?”

Kevin May feels that **Joe** is correct and that one of the guests (**Dr. Peter Anderson**) made that statement. **Preston Brown** reminded us that Dr. Anderson was not a member of the Board.

Preston Brown moved that we send the following as our JDCPG position:

We, the JDCPG find:

1. That PDS is NOT solely about the MSCP negotiations as County Planners claim. This was misleading.
2. That in fact the PPA shows that major portions of important material from the WFEP, have been **deleted** from the Dudek analysis in the DEIR already approved by the BOS on June 26, 2019.
3. That our Planning Group was not given the appropriate amount of time for public review and that the PDS did rush this through on short notice in an attempt to conceal the evidence of wildland fire hazards that experts had already predicted.
4. That of prime importance is the revelation of evidence and conclusions over the danger of a firetrap in the event of an emergency evacuation on Proctor Valley Road by the residents of Jamul.

We Recommend:

1. That the BOS reject the entire PPA.
2. We requested that the 3 expert reports, “The GCTC (Griffin Cove Transporting Consulting report, The REAX Engineering report, and the ROHDE & Associates Report for the San Diego County Fire Authority be

evaluated by the County Planners and DUDEK to resolve their differences and reach conclusions that can be resubmitted for public review.

3. That the County Planners be ordered to not change, alter, or delete any portions of the FDEIR already approved by the BOS without regular notice for required time for public review.
4. We further request that The County should show all sections that have been changed and identifying the exact alterations or deletions.
That the WFEP must include a study of the ambient traffic, the evacuation traffic from the residents of Jamul and traffic from people evacuating from the Casino. 53763806
5. That the WFEP must also include the possible scenario of Village 14 residents evacuating north into Jamul as Proctor Valley Road is their only alternative if they become blocked from going to Chula Vista.

Summer Piper suggested that the **motion was way too long and complicated and addressed ideas not in our purview**. She pointed out that the County is providing a new document due to the major changes. **Preston Brown** pointed out that they had deleted parts since the original was presented. **Summer Piper** said she would be in favor of pointing out that we did not receive the information in time, as the County came up with a new document and they edited the original, deleting information, and therefore we find that the Wildland Fire Report has many changes. She reminded us that if the proposed plan amendment fails, the PPA will revert back to the original.

Preston Brown suggested that we should ask the BOS to reject the proposed plan amendment and give the public time to review on the Wild Fire Evacuation Plan. **Joe Stuyvesant** said he felt that **Summer** was correct and that we could not vote to reject the PPA (Proposed Project Amendment) as we were discussing only the fire safety aspects of the project as per our agenda.

Darren Greenhaugh pointed out that the County had evaluated the report and they feel it is consistent with the already approved plan.

Dan Neirinckx stated that he questions whether the County had the responsibility to send us all of their reports they received. **Preston Brown** pointed out the RHODE Report is different and should have been shared.

Dan reminded us we needed to end the meeting at 9:30.

Preston Brown moved that we recommend that the BOS reject the Wild Land Fire Evacuation Plan and allow the community and the public to review it, as we find many deficiencies and it does not take into consideration the numerous sources of traffic, other than the residents of Village 14, that would rely on Proctor Valley Road in a Wild Land Fire Evacuation. The Rhodes Report was received just last Friday and therefore there has not been adequate time to have a public review.

MOTION DID NOT PASS: 7, Yes; 4, No.

Vote: Yes, 7: (Ed Mollen, Eve Nasby, Kevin May, Michael Casinelli, Janet Mulder, Preston Brown, Dan Neirinckx)

Vote: No, 4: (Joe Stuyvesant, Summer Piper, Darren Greenhaugh, Streeter Parker)

Absent: Steve Wragg

Summer Piper pointed out that if anyone recorded the meeting that it has to be maintained for a period of time. **Dan** was the only one to record the meeting and he will keep the recording for the required time necessary.

6. **ADJOURNMENT: Dan Neirinckx adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.**

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.sdcountry.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.