

\*\*\*\*\*SPECIAL NOTICE\*\*\*\*\*

To take part in the VIRTUAL meeting call in by phone at  
either 669-900-6833 Or 346-248-7799 starting at 7:20 pm.  
When directed, enter the meeting ID: 838-2399-7136 and  
Meeting Password: 528973

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 October 27, 2020**

**APPROVED: November 10, 2020**

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

CALL IN BEGINS AT 7:15 p.m.

**7:30 p.m.**

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair, Dan Neirinckx, called the JDCPG Virtual meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
2. **ROLL CALL**  
  
**Present: Dan Neirinckx, Janet Mulder, Michael Casinelli, Eve Nasby, Joe Stuyvesant, Preston Brown, Kevin May, Streeter Parker, Steve Wragg, Summer Piper,**  
  
**Absent: Ed Mollon, Darrin Greenhalgh**  
  
**Guests: Jim Bolz, Brian Stephenson, and Nate Stong, San Diego County**
3. **APPROVAL** of the Agenda for October 27, 2020 and Final Minutes for the Meeting of October 13, 2020. Approved unanimously.
4. **OPEN FORUM:**
  - a. **Eve Nasby** had an opportunity to help clean up after the fire and she would encourage all to contact [Byron@Jamul.org](mailto:Byron@Jamul.org) if we would like to help our neighbors.
  - b. **Eve Nasby** put up a poster regarding open seats on the Planning Group and would encourage us to contact people we think would be good members and follow through with them. Remember applications can be found and filled out online here....

## 5. State Route 94 Intersections, Safety Improvements.

**Preston Brown** welcomed **Jim Bolz**, **Brian Stephenson** and **Nate Stong** who are here tonight to share information from the County regarding the SR94 and Otay Lakes Road intersection. **Jim Bolz** showed a PowerPoint of the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) of Otay Lakes Road at SR-94 Intersection. He reminded us that the ICE report is not complete and is for information only and not for publication. The report was funded by the Jamul Indian Village through an Inter-Agency Agreement with Traffic Impact Fees associated with the Hollywood Casino. He went over the location of the intersection worked on by Rick Engineering which includes a stop control, roundabout, etc. but not the realignment of the road as it would be too expensive and has been ruled out because it is outside of the scope of an Intersection Control Evaluation.

A primary factor in the current operations and safety of the intersection is the insufficient corner sight distance from Otay Lakes Road to the east to approaching vehicles westbound on SR-94. The project intersection was analyzed for the existing traffic volumes during the observed peak period (Thursday 3-6pm) and peak hour of 4:15-5:15 pm, and the operating condition of the existing unsignalized intersection was calculated using the methodologies described in Chapter 19 of the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). **Steve Wragg** asked how could they use 2018 when it is 2020? **Jim Boltz** said they did not feel they could take the numbers today as they would not be true because of reduced traffic volumes due to Covid-19 problems, and the pre-pandemic volumes they are using are more reflective of typical volumes than if new counts were taken today. **Preston Brown** asked if the 1.1 million dollars from Jamul Casino is the total amount they are using. What about the Village 13 traffic mitigation? **Jim Boltz** pointed out that point only using the JIV funding at this point and that only about \$850,000 was allocated for this intersection. **Steve Wragg** asked if the modeling included Village 13 or 14 traffic? **Jim Boltz** said this was only funded by the JIV and did not consider Village 13 or 14 specifically, but did consider growth in the area based on the SANDAG modeling. **Michael Casinelli** asked if SANDAG had the modelling for the 2020 which would be more accurate? **Brian Stephenson** said that the SANDAG model projects out to 2050 and interpolation is used to back the numbers into current Average Daily Traffic for near future volumes. **Jim Bolz** showed chart of collision history by type and available traffic collision data was obtained from the Statewide Traffic Record Systems (SWITRS) database for the period January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2017. A total of 29 accidents with 19 injury collisions were reported at or in the vicinity of the study intersection during the 7-year period. The intersection meets traffic signal Warrant 7 (Crash Experience), with five or more crashes of the type susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal having occurred within a 12-month period. The ICE **Alternative Analysis** included an Acceleration Lane, Stop Controlled (2 of 3 approaches), Signalized Intersection and Roundabout, but these are not considered viable as there would be safety concerns as it would be too confusing for drivers. **Nate Stong** said that there are some 2 of 3 approaches stop controlled intersections like this existing in the State, but Caltrans is getting away from these types of intersections because they can be confusing. **Jim Bolz** told us the third alternative analysis was an All-Way Stop. This alternative was evaluated and discarded from consideration because it may create an unsafe condition due to insufficient sight distance for vehicles approaching from the east. **Nate Stong** points out that other things were also taken into consideration when this one was ruled out including overall delay and emissions. **Jim Bolz** talked about the option of a traffic signal which was evaluated based on different site distances and the possibility that they would need to hill on the south east back

and install a retaining wall. The last option of the alternative analysis is the Roundabout and seems to have more safety features but would require significant modification of the area including widening and a full replacement of the bridge and is therefore extremely expensive. However, it is possibly Caltrans' preferred alternative. **Nate Stong** pointed out that roundabouts are designed to accommodate large trucks. **Summer Piper** asked about the maximum speed in a roundabout. **Nate Stong** said that it requires about 25mph and the speed would need to be slowed considerably from the existing highway speed for it to work. **Preston Brown** asked about number and width of the lanes and **Nate Stong** said they have one 20-foot wide lane. **Preston Brown** asked if they had looked at the roundabouts approved for Village 13 as they did not seem to be that wide. **Preston Brown** said that the roundabout proposed by Caltrans includes the Honey Springs intersection which he feels is equally as dangerous as the Otay Lakes Intersection. **Nate Stong** had not seen it but thinks it sounds like a good plan for that area. **Dan Neirinckx** asked for Planning Group questions and asked which was the most likely design to be approved, as we would like to endorse or recommend a solution to the intersection. **Michael Casinelli** also asked which one would be the most effective and which is most likely to be approved. **Jim Bolz** stated the signalized intersection is a viable option, but that since the ICE is not finalized, he is unsure which alternative is preferred. **Nate Stong** stated that the roundabout and the signal would both work. **Steve Wragg** asked about the cutting back of the hillside and was told the problems are the high cost and the environmental concerns. **Steve Wragg** then asked about the cost of the signalized intersection. He pointed out that the cutting back of the hillside would do a much better job. **Jim Bolz** said the cost of the signalization would be approximately 5 million dollars and includes a retaining wall but without the retaining wall it would be about 2 million. **Steve Wragg** asked if they took into consideration Village 13 and 14 traffic and Caltrans gave us some alternatives to "fixing" Highway 94 but he wants us to be careful to make sure that the alternatives are not decided only by money with safety not being considered. **Preston Brown** pointed out that we want to make recommendations that would be long-lasting. He pointed out that there is a dangerous turn on Honey Springs as it has sight distance problems and elevation and directional changes from the west which are very bad and would need some work to make it safe. He suggested instead of increasing the site line by cutting out the hill, but rather instead, moving Otay Lakes Road closer to the bridge and further from the hillside to make it less of a problem. **Jim Bolz** said if the Planning Group wants to recommend realignment of Otay Lakes Road to intersect opposite Honey Springs Rd at SR94, they can do it. He stated that the Planning Group is an advisory group to the County, and if you as a group have an idea that would make a better intersection than the County has presented, further studies can be done, provided there is money, and it is a priority for the County and Caltrans. **Preston Brown** asked if they would be working with Caltrans to come up with a viable alternative like one we might suggest. **Jim Bolz** said they do work with Caltrans and reminded us that this is Caltrans' facility. **Preston Brown** asked, "Why not look at the traffic impacts of Village 13 and 14 as well as the Jamul Casino?" Village 13 is projected to add over 26,000 ADT's and some portion of this will use this intersection. He said he could not find the estimated percentage in the traffic study. **Nate Stong** replied that he believed it was 11% that would impact this intersection. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that Village 13 does not have any amount attributed to it as it has not been approved as yet and Village 14 has not taken this intersection into consideration, and he feels it would be a waste of time to include Village 14 as they have already been approved. **Dan Neirinckx** thanked the three gentlemen from the County for attending our meeting and told them we would send in our recommendations.

6. **Resource Protection Ordinance and Grading Ordinance update.** **Preston Brown** saw the presentation and told us it had a three-step plan to simplify and unite the various

overlapping ordinances and regulations in order to speed up the approval process and make it less expensive and burdensome to developers. After the presentation he attended was complete, the presenters asked for their reactions and everyone present at the meeting asked for more information. The RPO was created in 1988 and has had some alterations but the purpose of the update is to encourage affordable housing by upgrading the requirements. The Advanced Planning Group led by Eric Lardy will present this initial proposal to the BOS meeting on Dec. 9 where they will probably just introduce their ideas in a three-stage process to simplify the process. This may take some time. **Dan Neirinckx** said we will get a briefing after the BOS has given the Advanced Planning Group some directions.

**7. Possible Reduction in Number of Planning Group Seats – Letter to Supervisor Jacob**

**Dan Neirinckx** informed us that he had written a letter to Supervisor Dianne Jacob voicing our suggestion to reduce the number of members in our JDCPG as we discussed at our last meeting. We recommended the number be cut from 15 to 13, recognizing that the number would mean that a quorum would then be 7 rather than 8 which should help us in reaching a quorum both in attendance and on passing of a vote both of which require a quorum to achieve. Supervisor Jacob did tell us that other Planning Groups have dropped their number for exactly the same reasons, and she will get back to us regarding our request. He pointed out that we heard from her office that she had not received the letter and so he resent it and would expect to hear before our next meeting.

**8.JDCPG OFFICER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS**

- 1. SR 94 and Otay Lakes Road will be put on next agenda for our recommendation.**
  - 2. Traffic Advisory Council meeting – may want to attend – Any recommendations should be sent to the Traffic Advisory Council.**
  - 3. Michael Casinelli reminded us that we only have 2 meetings until the end of the year and Dan said we usually don’t meet the second Tuesday in November or December due to the proximity to the holidays.**
- 9. Adjournment: Chair Dan Neirinckx adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m. reminding us that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 10, 2020 at 7:30 p.m.**

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Janet Mulder, Secretary**

**NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

**7:30 P.M. TUESDAY November 10, 2020**

**SITE: Virtual Meeting format until public/in-person meetings permitted.**

**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.

## **JAMUL/DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

### **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:*

*To provide a public forum where local citizens can learn about issues of importance to them and their community and provide input.*

*To carefully consider all input when advising the county on such issues as planning, land use, discretionary projects, and community and sub-regional plans.*

**APPROVED 5/12/2020**