To take part in the VIRTUAL meeting call in by phone at either 669-900-6833 Or 346-248-7799 starting at 7:15 pm. When directed, enter the meeting ID: 825-8974-8600 and Meeting Password: 827443

You will be placed 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.

JAMUL DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

FINAL MINUTES
Tuesday FEBRUARY 9, 2021
APPROVED FEB. 23, 2021

*******VIRTUAL MEETING*******
CALL IN BEGINS AT 7:15 p.m.
7:30 p.m.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair, Dan Neirinckx, called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.
- 2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Dan Neirinckx, Janet Mulder, Preston Brown. Summer Piper, Ed Mollon, Steve Wragg, Michael Casinelli, Kevin May, Streeter Parker

Absent:

Vacant: Seats 5, 7, 9, 11,13,14 (11 – Eve Nasby who forgot to pull her election papers)

Guests: Becky Rapp, Amber Recklau, Judy Strang, Rachel Vedder, Eve Nasby, Amie Hayes

3. APPROVAL of the Agenda for February 9, 2021 and Final Minutes for the Meeting of January 26, 2021. Motion to approve made by **Preston Brown** passed unanimously.

4. **OPEN FORUM**

a. Kevin May reported that the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) has said, after further investigation, that the intersection of Proctor Valley and Maxfield Roads does not qualify for an "All Stop" being installed. They are working on a solution that uses additional signage and road markings to make the intersection safer. When the proposal is written up, they will share that with us to get our input before submitting the final

proposal to the TAC. The next TAC meeting is March 12, 2021 at 9:00 am, so **Kevin May** has personally investigated this intersection and found these two issues: 1) speeding of traffic that is east bound on Proctor Valley road as it approaches this intersection, and 2) the inability to see that same traffic until just before it arrives at this intersection, while parked at the stop sign on Maxfield road and heading west, and visa versa.

- b. Kevin May reported on the Cellular FP-2 Policy that in November of 2020 Deputy Fire Marshall David Sibbet requested input on the proposed revisions for FP-2 Policy regarding Fire Code Compliance for Cellular Facilities. The purpose of the revisions was to establish a uniform countywide application process for cellular facilities regarding fire prevention measures. At that time, Kevin reviewed and submitted his suggestions/edits. On January 29, 2021, he received an email from Sibbet informing me that, before the end of February, the revisions will be released for public review and input.
- c. Janet Mulder asked to have the "needle exchange program" proposal letter from Supervisor Joel Anderson that will be brought before the BOS, be on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting, because she feels there is no need for a needle exchange program in our Jamul Dulzura area. They should recommend putting the needle exchange program locations where the problems of finding needles on the ground and sidewalk exist today in the cities, but not so much in the back country. Kevin May suggested that the Planning Group was not the appropriate place to bring it up. Dan Neirincx will check with legal regarding whether or not we should discuss.
- **d. Preston Brown** will bring up the MSCP at the next meeting as well as the Climate Action Plan. He sent out a report from the sub-committee working on the evacuation paths for the community, which will be brought up at the next meeting. This part of the Safety Element and we will need to discuss and have on the agenda and expect public comment.
- **e. Ed Mollon** asked about the parking lot put in at SR94 and Millar Ranch Road. Apparently signage has been a problem. **Dan Neirinckx** contacted Jill Terp and expected to hear back from her by today, but will re-contact her for an update.
- **Michael Cassinelli** asked how our guests found out about our meeting like via post office or on our mailing list. One of the guests found us on the County website, and one was informed by the PTA as to the date and time. **Michael** said that as representatives from Jamul, we need to solicit the reaction of our community on our questions.
- g. Dan Neirinckx pointed out that Amie Hayes, a Restore Specialist with Save our Heritage Organization, was attending our meeting to find out about the Barrett House as they have been approached by members of the community to find out what is happening and would like to make sure it stays in the forefront as it has lots of history. Eve Nasby pointed out that she and others are looking to try to establish the Barrett House as a community building, Eve will contact Amie Hayes.

- **h. Eve Nasby** said she too, is concerned about the Needle Exchange and wants to make sure that we do discuss it.
- 5. County General Plan changes: 1. Safety Element, 2. Environmental Justice Element Preston Brown suggested we put this on the agenda for the next meeting and his subcommittee will make a report at that time.
- 6. Shelter Facilities Zoning Ordina Revisions, POD 20-008 Dan Neirinckx talked with staff and will put it back on the agenda after it is out for public review.
- 7. County Guidelines for Hydrology and Water Quality: Dan Neirinckx said he does not see any problems or "shortcuts" for the developers, but basically just improves the process. Steve Wragg asked his specialists to give him some input and they did not get back to him. He suggested we need to hear from the County about this proposal. Janet Mulder reminded us that more than 2/3 of our Planning Group Area is dependent upon ground water for their lives, which makes anything to do with Hydrology and Water Quality very important to our Planning Area. Dan Neirinckx will ask County Staff to brief us on the changes at the next meeting.

8. Board of Supervisors Recommended County Cannabis Zoning Changes.

Janet Mulder asked the question, "Why are they recommending these changes to the back-Country?" People don't want Cannabis sold in their communities as it draws a criminal element. There are lots of dispensaries in cities to get cannabis and it would only create traffic. We were told that Proposition 64 was "overwhelming supported" which isn't true...Only 57% of the votes supported it – hardly consider that overwhelming! Almost half of us voted "no"! The proposition did say that communities would be able to determine whether or not they wanted to allow it within their community, and not be mandated as a total County. In 2017, the BOS voted to prohibit permits for new medical facilities with a 2035 sunset clause. In Colorado, the Sheriff and DA both opposed the Proposition and it was proven that it did not eliminate the drug cartel and in fact, increased the number of cartels in Colorado after the law was implemented. My suggestion is that we ask our Supervisor to support the existing ordinance (2017) realizing that cannabis is actually marijuana and it IS a Gateway drug giving greater accessibility to youth, the more on the market the greater exposure to kids! Evidence exists through the Sheriff that in the City of Chula Vista, on any given block there were more illegal shops than legal selling on the black market. I put in a call and an email to Hannah Gbeh to find out where the Farm Bureau is on this ordinance as I know they used to agree to only cultivation, and no dispensing with rules about cutting it in an enclosed area. Hopefully they will also see the terrific problem that occurs when legal facilities are opened as the illegal facilities multiply even faster, compounding an already difficult problem by further exposing the youth of our unincorporated communities to a greater degree to marijuana. Summer Piper pointed out that there is evidence that Marijuana is a gateway drug and while the Sheriff does try to keep out the illegal ones, and that opening more areas is not the answer. Ed Mollen is concerned about traffic, people coming because of the numbers it would bring into our community when we were already concerned about evacuation problems. Streeter Parker worked much of his life with addicts and feels the further introduction of marijuana is destructive. Michael Casinelli suggested that people who took cannabis following chemotherapy were benefited, so wasn't

sure where to go with it. Steve Wragg pointed out that Supervisor Anderson wanted to know what the Planning Group's role is, and he feels it is here to stay and we need to make sure we put in the rules to safeguard our community and its residents. Eve Nasby strongly opposes the proposal for our community. Rachel Vedder has dealt with addiction in her career and has concerns of it being in our community and has mixed emotions but would like to see research on what happens when it is legal within the community. Amber Recklau agrees with the problems that others have voiced tonight. Becky Rapp pointed out that this was proposed by two Supervisors (Fletcher and Vargas) who do not have unincorporated areas within their district. Cash and crime walk hand in hand. The final ordinance is to be presented to the Board in 90 days and she encouraged us to contact the BOS meeting tomorrow and give our opinion as to how it would impact our community. Eve Nasby asked her to post her comments on the Jamul Facebook page. Judy Strang member of the PTA Board has commented on this BOS non-agenda item and encouraged us to call in via Community Comments which happens first thing. She, too, has been concerned about the fact that Supervisor Fletcher proposed this and does not have any unincorporated area within his District. Dan Neirinckx said while he was reading the letters from Supervisor Anderson about this, he saw on television a robbery taking place at a Cannabis facility in Spring Valley. Preston Brown pointed out that if we participate in this as a group, we can make our suggestions to make it more beneficial. He points out that local governments everywhere want the tax revenues from cannabis and we should have a say as to where they should be located rather than someone else making those decisions for us. Kevin May told us that Hannah Gbeh is quoted in a news article where she pointed out that it is most regulated and would be beneficial to the Farm Bureau. Janet asked if the article said that Hannah was speaking for the Farm Bureau or as an individual? Kevin said it was difficult to tell. Steve Wragg pointed out that some time ago they wanted to do exclusionary zoning for crematoriums which nobody wanted in their backyard. He feels that this is similar as the zoning is coming and we need to suggest controls be put on it to address our concerns. We need to let Supervisor Anderson know our concerns like where they would be located as well as regulations we would like to see created. We could suggest that they use industrial areas to locate. Becky Rapp pointed out that currently the distance before schools would be 1000 feet but Supervisor Fletcher is now suggesting dropping to 600 feet. Staff is proposing this change. Becky Rapp pointed out that changing the location would allow them to put them in the heart of the community. She gave Julian as an example, where a school is part of the downtown community. Preston Brown asked Steve how they resolved the crematorium issue and Steve Wragg said it was a lawsuit with lots of controls which limited their operation. One can't decide that a business cannot exist, but we need to make important requirements to regulate their activities and location. Judy Strang pointed Proposition 64 allowed the individual communities to make a decision. Summer Piper pointed out that she is not opposed to the funding issue, but she would like for the BOS to understand that this is uncontrolled and they need to figure out how they are going to control the problem and its issues before they open it up further.

This item will be put back on the agenda for the next meeting (Feb. 23, 2021 - 7:30) Janet Mulder said she would invite Dana Stevens to join us at the meeting. Dana has written several scholarly articles on the subject, but had another commitment this evening.

9. JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

a. Dan Neirnclx pointed out that the Planning Group Chairs will be meeting Thursday concerning the Cannibas proposal and he would take the information presented tonight to the meeting and share it with the Chairs.

b. Dan Neirnckx asked Janet Mulder if she had discussed with Supervisor Joel **Anderson's** Office about when we should be able to add our new members as **Supervisor Anderson** needs to present it to the BOS. She pointed out that his office had lots of questions as to how we recruit our members. They were concerned (as are we) with the length of time we have had vacancies. (Some due in no small part to the pandemic restrictions) She told them about our articles in our local paper, *The Jamul Shopper*, the application link is featured on each set of minutes and agendas that is sent to over 240 people via email, as well as our Facebook page and most importantly word of mouth. After they have submitted their application and been approved as far as residency is concerned by the Registrar of Voters, we ask them to attend our meetings where they introduce themselves to the existing Planning Group members who interview the applicant. A discussion of the Planning Group members is held and a vote is taken. The Chair notifies the applicant and tells them that our Supervisor has to make the proposal to the BOS. They are told when the next training is scheduled and asked to fill out 700 form, become familiar with Form I-1, and asked to continue coming to the bi-monthly JDCPG meetings until we hear back from the Supervisor that they have been approved for membership. All of the information was given to the Supervisor's office and they were asked to please get back to us as soon as possible as we are currently at nine members and need eight for a quorum at the meetings! Supervisor Anderson's office assures her they will work as quickly as they can. She gave them Jessica Turner's name, email and phone number hoping to expedite their response.

10. Adjournment: Chair, Dan Neirinckx, adjourned the meeting at 8:56

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Mulder, Secretary

NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

7:30 P.M. TUESDAY February 23, 2021

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

NOTICE OF SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING.

GENERAL PLAN: SAFETY ELEMENT AND

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ELEMENT

6:30 P.M. TUESDAY FEBRUARY 9, 2021

VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT, SIGNIN/JOIN INFORMATION SAME AS REGULAR MEETING CALLIN BEGINS AT 6:20 PM

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.

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