

*****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: 821-3784-8378 and
Meeting Password:624082

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*****

**JAMUL DULZURA
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
FINAL MINUTES
Tuesday June 23, 2020**

APPROVED AUGUST 25, 2020

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

7:30 p.m.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Dan Neirinckx3 called the virtual meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

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

ABSENT: None

VACANT SEATS: 9, 13 &14

Visitors: Stephen Haafe, San Diego; Bill Robinson, Dulzura.

3. **APPROVAL** of the Agenda for June 23, 2020 and Final Minutes for May 26, 2020 and the Final Minutes of the Special Meeting of June 2, 2020. All present voted Yes.

4. **OPEN FORUM**

A. Eve Nasby gave a “shout out” to the firefighters for their help in Jamul!

Thanks were echoed by **Streeter Parker** and **Preston Brown** (who lives right down from where the fire started, and the firemen used a pond to draw water to fight the fire!) **Summer Piper** added her appreciation for their quick response. **The whole JDCPG applauds the fire crews and we are grateful for their fine work!**

B. Michael Casinelli asked to present his thoughts concerning what he sees as the role of the Community Planning Groups in general and JDCPG’s role in particular. He reminded us that, CPGs were created by the Board of Supervisors for the purpose of advising and assisting the Director of Planning & Development Services, the Zoning Administrator, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in the preparation, amendment and implementation of community and sub-regional plans. Sometimes CPGs provide the communities’ perspective on projects in the county that have already been okayed by DPS, prior to that project being heard by the BOS. CPGs are the voice of our communities; not a subdivision of PDS. He concluded, suggesting that as members of the JDCPG, we are charged with looking out for the best interests of the community with which we are so familiar, and who would be forced to live with the negative repercussions of land use projects that are not in our best interest. This is the task to which we have been assigned, and we want to make sure we are representing our Jamul & Dulzura communities well. He concluded, “Thank you for allowing me this time to speak.”

5. **Special Events Permit Ordinance Update – Dan Neirinckx, Chair**, pointed out that at the meeting at which we covered this, we discussed possible recommendations as follows:
 - a. Long standing community events should be exempted from the regulations even though they may have over 600 people.
 - b. CEQA requirements may not be understood and difficult to interpret.
 - c. Exceptions need to be made for non-profits allowing for discounts and fee waivers.

After reviewing the questionnaire, **Dan Neirinckx**, feels it is easy to understand and that it will be understood and is quite appropriate and he no longer has a problem with the second concern voiced. **Michael Casinelli** read through the proposed ordinance again and his concern regarding fees seems to be now left up to the Supervisors. y asked when it would be before the BOS and **Dan Neirinckx** said he thinks it will come before the Board tomorrow. **Streeter Parker** asked how would the “non-profit” status of a group be determined? **Dan Neirinckx** said they were discussing bicycle races and that type of event. They would probably need a tax-exempt identification. **Preston Brown** pointed out that the cost was due to the fact that the County used to provide the equipment at no cost to the organization (like cones, barriers, etc) and this would allow the expense of the event to be on the shoulders of the individual organization and relieve the County of this cost.

Michael Casinelli moved that the JDCPG support the Public Works recommendation to update the Special Events Permit Ordinance. Motion carried unanimously (11-0) with Steve Wragg not present at the time.

Ed Mollen moved that the JDCPG recommend that any community events established prior to 2010 be exempted from fees. Motion passed unanimously (11-0) with Steve Wragg having left the meeting.

6. **Otay Ranch Village 13. (Residential and commercial development located along Otay Lakes Road between Pio Pico RV Park and Chula Vista.)** **Preston Brown** pointed out that this will not come before the BOS until August 5, and there are lots of questions and the information was sent to the sub-committee. There will be a **SANDAG Forum on July 8, 1-3 p.m.** and would be the SB743 Inauguration. **Rick Curry** will be leading the discussion. **Preston Brown** is going to be out of town and asked others to attend the virtual meeting. **Dan Neirinckx will attend.** He pointed out to the visitor that we will not be discussing this and invited the guest who was here on this agenda item to speak. **Stephen Haase**, the visitor, said he would follow the Planning Group Agenda and contact us later. **Michael Casinelli** asked when the notes from the Sub-committee would be sent out. **Summer Piper** pointed out that a sub-committee’s notes should not be sent ahead of the meeting. **Darrin Greenhaugh** disagreed and said that a sub-committee report that will be discussed at a meeting, can be sent out with the Agenda. **Eve Nasby** asked if a member of the community can be a member of a sub-committee. **Janet Mulder** pointed out that according to BOS Policy, sub-committee members can include members of the community, but must have less than a majority of Planning Group members. She reminded us that community members can be voting members of the sub-committee. **Joe Stuyvesant** asked what is the issue the Sub-committee is working on? **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that we aren’t discussing density or anything like that but rather the traffic impacts that the development might have on our community. **Joe Stuyvesant** asked if our Planning Group would be making recommendations. **Dan Neirinckx** said that the modeling has many different forms and we would like for them to re-look at Otay Lakes Road. **Joe Stuyvesant** asked if we could invite SANDAG to our meeting regarding the modeling. **Preston Brown** said that if the applicant proposes an intersection in our area as a mitigation measure, our group needs to understand the process for interpreting the SANDAG traffic models and how Caltrans reaches its conclusions on the measures that are necessary or possible for mitigation. And in this case, what happens to the dollars proposed by the applicant for a traffic mitigation that may not be enough to enact a necessary improvement. That is why the sub-committee was formed originally. **Kevin May** pointed out that Janet was correct as **Article 5** clearly states that members of the community can vote in the sub-committee meeting, but not JDCPG meetings. A Sub-committee report will be on the agenda for the next JDCPG meeting.
7. **State Senate Bill 743 (Changes to CEQA traffic impacts analysis)** **Dan Neirinckx** stated that SB743 replaces LOS with VMT analysis in CEQA actions. **Darrin Greenhaugh** said that at the Planning Group Meeting of the Chairs, he was told that while there will be analysis on the vehicles miles travelled, they will also look at an evaluation of the Level of Service and if there is mitigation needed it would be made part of the CEQA document. Both LOS & VMT would be covered in CEQA analysis. **Dan Neirinckx** read from the article online on this subject that LOS can be considered but that the new metric will be

VMT. The two types of analysis are VMT and LOS and LOS is not a CEQA requirement but would be used by the County for impact analysis. **Ed Mollen** said that the VMT was not appropriate to a rural area as the mitigations of bike lanes and pedestrian crossing are not effective in the rural areas. **Dan Neirinckx reminded us that the impact fee program and VMT exchange credit are the two methods of mitigation. Concern is if they use exchange credit it could be any-where and we would prefer them to use the Impact Fee program. We strongly propose that they use the mitigation locally (through impact fees) as first priority and then if unavailable the exchange could be outside of the area. Dan Neirinckx recommended that we study this farther and make a recommendation at the next meeting which would still be in time for the BOS meeting in July.**

Planning and Development services will continue to use LOS to determine the traffic impacts that a project has on the surrounding community. **Darrin Greenhaugh** pointed out that when the County talked about this they emphasized road safety and asked if that should be included? **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that they were looking at the impacts through the LOS process as part of a project analysis to identify the impacts a project has on traffic. **Michael Casinelli** asked **Darrin** if they discussed when the mitigation fees are correct and there are not enough funds to do the mitigation? **Darrin and Dan** both said they did not hear anything about that. **Preston Brown** said that we need to know how they are going to interpret the VMT and how it will impact the Village 13 when it comes before the BOS in August. He pointed out that they could reduce the amount of mitigation they would need if they used only the area impacted. He suggested that we need to know what is actually available as a mitigation for this project so we could see its impacts.

Steven Haafe, visitor, pointed out that it is on the BOS Agenda for tomorrow not July 24 as Preston suggested. He has done planning for several years. There is a relationship between VMT and LOS and it is possible to come into a conflict with each other since VMT is the CEQA threshold. The two may come into conflict and the concern is where we invest our dollars. Therefore we need to make a recommendation tonight if we are going to make one. Discussion was held and the BOS is working with the “options to apply”. **The JDCPG reminds the BOS that the VMT and the LOS will be looked at quite differently in the rural area. Summer Piper** reminded us that they were looking at either a whole County VMT or sub-areas VMT. **Ed Mollen** thanked our visitor **Steven** for succinctly relating the impacts. He suggested that in the unincorporated areas that they should use LOS as the VMT is not as appropriate in rural areas. **Summer Piper** reminded us that it is State Law and will be used by the County. **Dan Neirinckx** said that the VMT will be used in CEQA as that is the new law. **Preston Brown** suggested that we ask for more time to understand the differences between the two choices, but **Dan Neirinckx** said we can’t do that. **Summer Piper** said if we moved to recommend that they do a County-wide VMT we would never have any building here as there is no project that could meet the VMT. The County said in our meeting that the County-wide VMT would be very low and the urban areas would be approved, but in our area none would be improved. **Preston Brown** reminded us that this would only impact large projects, not small projects. He said that of course the County is going to choose the option to separate the Unincorporated County because this changes the baseline from which the percentage of impact is determined. If you use the whole County and include the urban areas, this is a more realistic way to measure VMT. The whole point of the CEQA VMT is to discourage sprawl and encourage infill development closer to city centers and along transit corridors. We also need to understand, as **Ed** pointed out, how mitigation will be handled, what is in the “toolbox” for doing effective mitigation in rural areas.

Summer Piper moved that the JDCPG recommend against the adoption of the County-wide metric in deciding VMT analysis. We concur with the County recommendation to retain LOS analysis to determine traffic impacts and fees. We recommend that VMT mitigation be determined by impact fee program and the fees be spent in the localized area in which they incurred.

Motion did not carry: Vote: Yes, 7: Summer Piper, Kevin May, Joe Stuyvesant, Streeter Parker, Janet Mulder, Dan Neirinckx, Darrin Greenhaugh, Opposed, 4: Eve Nasby, Michael Casinelli, Preston Brown, and Ed Mollen. Steve Wragg left the meeting earlier.

Eve Nasby moved that the JDCPG state that we concur with the County recommendation to retain LOS analysis to determine traffic impacts and fees. We recommend that VMT mitigation be determined by Impact Fee Program and further that the fees be spent in the localized area in which they incurred.

Motion passed unanimously with Steve Wragg absent. All present voted “yes”.

8. JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

- A. **Preston Brown and Eve Nasby** will research the **American Society of Landscape Architect Grant Program** and report back to the JDCPG
- B. **Darrin Greenhaugh** reported that at the Chairs meeting it was pointed out that some of the Planning Groups that utilize Zoom for their virtual meetings use a limited access that allows one to come one to the screen when it is their time to speak. Uses less bandwidth and may help fix poor connections like Preston had tonight.
- C. **Dan Neirinckx** told us that the new **Tractor Supply (on Jefferson)** has requested a signage change asking to have more lighting. **Project given to Michael Casinelli and Eve Nasby.** **Michael** has already made contact with the County and will talk with them at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, and will share the information with **Eve.**

9. Adjournment:

Dan Neirinckx, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Janet Mulder, Secretary

NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

7:30 P.M. TUESDAY July 14, 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.